

# *THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1956*

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS, 83D ANNUAL FORUM  
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, MAY 20-25, 1956

PUBLISHED 1956 FOR THE  
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK  
BY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK

*Copyright © 1956, National Conference of Social Work, Columbus, Ohio  
Published by Columbia University Press, New York*

*Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 8-35377*

PUBLISHED IN GREAT BRITAIN, CANADA, INDIA, AND PAKISTAN  
BY THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON, TORONTO, BOMBAY, AND KARACHI

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA





## *The National Conference of Social Work*

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK, a voluntary association of individual and organizational members, has since 1874 provided a national forum for social welfare. The change of name, effective July 1, 1956, to the National Conference on Social Welfare was voted by the members to describe more accurately its purposes and functions.

The annual forums furnish a two-way channel of communication between paid and volunteer workers, between social work and allied fields, and between the functional services and the profession.

In addition to the annual forums, the National Conference serves as a clearinghouse of basic educational materials for use on local, state, national, and international levels.

The Conference has a comprehensive publications program, and provides services to the state and international conferences of social welfare.



## *Foreword*

CHANGE WAS IN THE AIR in St. Louis. It greeted the more than five thousand social workers, their friends and colleagues, who gathered in that city to attend the 83d Annual Forum of the National Conference of Social Work. It was fitting that this year, when the Conference chose for its theme "The Challenge of Change," it also chose a changing city to be its host. In recent years St. Louis, although ideally situated geographically, had been passed up as an Annual Forum meeting place, since all its hotels would not assure equal accommodations to all Conference members. Now that St. Louis is meeting this particular "challenge of change," it was possible for the Annual Forum to be held there.

Two kinds of change challenged conference-goers and kept them in earnest discussion for six stimulating days. Changes in society were highlighted by outstanding speakers at General Sessions and in the Lindeman Memorial Lectures. Social work leaders and colleagues from other professions were informative and thought-provoking as they pointed out changes in such areas as population, race relations, industrialization, patterns of conformity, and social values. Current and potential changes in social welfare programs and in the profession of social work were then discussed at section and associate group meetings. In these latter gatherings, smaller groups and less formal presentations made it possible for Conference members to participate actively in the discussion of issues raised.

Along this line it is of interest to note that while the total number of Conference registrants was less than at some other Annual Forums, there were fewer one-day attenders. Participants came early, attended meetings conscientiously, and stayed late.

On the lighter side, Conference members felt challenged by two other changes. The St. Louis traffic system, obviously different

from the ones back home, sent many scurrying for safety. And temperature changes, as people moved from the air-conditioned auditorium through sun-baked streets to air-conditioned hotels, brought forth a variety of colorful stoles.

No changes have been made in regard to the publication of this volume, however. It is felt that the reasons for publication of the Proceedings of the Annual Forum are twofold. For those fortunate enough to attend the Conference, this book will recapture some of the highlights. For those unable to attend, it shares some of the knowledge and findings from the Forum. Papers selected for this volume were chosen because of their broad, general interest. In the two companion books, *Case Work Papers, 1956*, and *Group Work and Community Organization, 1956*, material of a more specific nature may be found.

Thanks are due to my two diligent associates on the Editorial Committee, Mrs. Elinor P. Zaki and Ellen Winston, for their help in selecting material for this publication. Appreciation is also hereby expressed to Mrs. Eula Wyatt and Joe R. Hoffer of the Conference staff for their able assistance. Special thanks are extended to our competent and devoted editor, Mrs. Dorothy M. Swart, of Columbia University Press.

LOIS CORKE DESANTIS  
*Chairman, Editorial Committee*

July 19, 1956

## *National Conference of Social Work Award*

A SIGNIFICANT MILESTONE in the development of the social work profession was reached on October 1, 1955, when seven social work membership associations terminated their activities and formed a single, unified professional association known as the National Association of Social Workers. This goal was achieved as a result of careful study, planning, and negotiation by representatives of the following seven organizations: American Association of Group Workers, American Association of Medical Social Workers, American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers, American Association of Social Workers, Association for the Study of Community Organization, National Association of School Social Workers, Social Work Research Group. The attainment of this long-sought objective reflected the growing conviction on the part of social work practitioners that there was need for greater unity within the social work profession, and an organizational structure through which the resources of the profession could be utilized most effectively for the improvement and strengthening of social welfare programs.

The first formal step leading toward the establishment of the NASW was taken in 1948. In the years that followed, careful study was given by the memberships of all the associations to the principles on which the new organization was to be created. This study culminated in an overwhelming affirmative vote on the part of the members of all seven organizations to establish the National Association of Social Workers in the fall of 1955. Major responsibility for formulating the plan of organization, which served as the foundation of the new professional organization, was vested in a Planning Committee of the Temporary Inter-Association Council which was made up of representatives of each of the

seven organizations. Members of the Planning Committee were: AAGW, Sanford Solender (chairman), Janet Korpela; AAMSW, Mary L. Hemmy, Mary L. Poole; AAPSW, Marcene Gabell, Ruth I. Knee; AASW, Joseph P. Anderson, Melvin A. Glasser; ASCO, Philip E. Ryan, Amy Wells; NASSW, Opal Boston, Ruth E. Smalley; SWRG, Margaret Blenkner, Elbert Hooker.

In recognition of the outstanding contribution which this group made to social welfare, the National Conference of Social Work presented its 1956 Award to it with the following citation:

For giving unstintedly of their knowledge, skills and time to conduct long and arduous negotiations leading to the formation of the National Association of Social Workers; for exercising unusually creative imagination in evolving a structure for the new Association which is carrying forward the strengths of the predecessor organizations and at the same time making possible an integrated program to advance the interest of the social work profession and the nation it serves; and even beyond defining the structure, for planning and presenting an outline of program content which was enthusiastically adopted by the Board of Directors and which has made it possible for the new National Association to launch immediately a strong and effective program.

# Contents

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK	v
FOREWORD <i>Lois Corke DeSantis</i>	vii
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK AWARD	ix
THE CONTRIBUTORS	xiii

## *The Challenge of Change*

1. CURRENT SOCIAL FRONTIERS <i>Benjamin E. Youngdahl</i>	3 X
2. HAS THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL WORK BECOME OUTMODDED? <i>Agnes E. Meyer</i>	26 X

## *Changing Patterns of Thought and Action*

3. CONFORMITY AND FREEDOM <i>Telford Taylor</i>	42 X
4. THE REAL TRAGEDIES OF DESEGREGATION <i>Carl T. Rowan</i>	58 X
5. DESEGREGATION AND INTEGRATION IN SOCIAL WORK <i>Savilla Millis Simons</i>	67 X
6. LABOR AND SOCIAL WELFARE <i>Joseph A. Beirne</i>	77 X
7. RELIGION AND SOCIAL CASEWORK <i>Felix P. Biestek, S.J.</i>	86 X

## *Developments in the Public Social Services*

9. OUR CHALLENGE IN SOCIAL WELFARE <i>Marion B. Folsom</i>	96 X
10. MEDICAL CARE IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS <i>Franz Goldmann, M.D.</i>	107 X

- 11 A TEN-YEAR PLAN FOR IMPROVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE  
Corinne H. Wolfe 120 X

### *Practice in Selected Areas*

- 13 PRINCIPLES, VALUES, AND ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING ADOPTION PRACTICE Joseph H. Reid 130 X
- 14 SOCIAL GROUP WORK THEORY AND PRACTICE Gertrude Wilson 143 X
- 15 WHAT IS COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PRACTICE IN SOCIAL WORK? Violet M. Sieder 160 X

### *The Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lectures*

- 16 DEMOGRAPHY AND HUMAN ECOLOGY IN RELATION TO SOCIAL WORK Philip M. Hauser 175 X
- 17 THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRIALIZATION ON FAMILY LIFE Harold L. Wilensky 202 X
- 18 SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE GROUP Muzafer Sherif 219 X

### *Appendixes*

- A. PROGRAM 235 X
- B. BUSINESS ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE FOR 1956 261 X

- Index* 269



## *The Contributors*

JOSEPH A. BEIRNE, President, Communications Workers Union; Vice President, AFL-CIO; Chairman, Community Services Committee, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

FELIX P. BIESTEK, S.J., Director of Field Work, School of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago

MARION B. FOLSOM, Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

FRANZ GOLDMANN, M.D., Associate Professor of Medical Care, Harvard School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston

PHILIP M. HAUSER, Director, Population Research and Training Center and Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago

AGNES E. MEYER, Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH H. REID, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., New York

CARL T. ROWAN, Minneapolis *Tribune*

MUZAFAER SHERIF, Director, Institute of Group Relations, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

VIOLET M. SIEDER, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

SAVILLA MILLIS SIMONS, General Secretary, Y.W.C.A. of the United States of America, New York

TELFORD TAYLOR, attorney, Landis, Taylor & Scoll, New York; formerly Chief Prosecutor, Nuremberg War Crimes Trials

HAROLD L. WILENSKY, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

GERTRUDE WILSON, Professor of Social Welfare, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

CORINNE H. WOLFE, Chief, Division of Technical Training, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

BENJAMIN E. YOUNGDAHL, Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; President, National Conference of Social Work



*THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1956*



## *Current Social Frontiers*

by BENJAMIN E. YOUNGDAHL

I SHOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU my ideas on "The Challenge of Change." I propose to examine the phenomenon of change as it affects the profession of social work: to point out the accomplishments of the past, the needs of the present, and the challenges of the future, and in so doing, outline some of the issues that will be discussed in detail at the 1956 Annual Forum.

Change itself is neither good nor bad. Change begets change and generates harmonizing readjustments in wide circles. The industrial revolution brought laborsaving devices into the home, thereby bringing leisure time or release of time to the housewife and mother. The leisure time, in turn, helped to bring women into industry. This series of changes brought, much later, the need for the creation of a new social work program: day care centers and other protective devices for children. Our culture is so interrelated that a change in one trait or complex brings a chain reaction of adjustments.

The rapidity of a social change is as important as change itself. An important development that has taken place on a national basis in the last few generations is the expansion of urbanization. Today less than one fourth of our population still live on farms. While this process has been going on throughout the greater part of our history, it has been accelerated in recent decades. The more rapid the change, the greater the adjustment that becomes necessary. In a relatively short time, we have been transformed from a nation of primary or face-to-face relationships to one of secondary or indirect group relationships. The older loyalties of kinship and locality have tended to dissolve, and an intensification of in-

dividualism has evolved. Each person finds himself relating to many wider or secondary groups which may not have the same framework of standards. When the values are in conflict the individual is caught in a dilemma. Thus a changing society presents challenging moral problems.

Large change requires boldness in order to adjust and adapt. In October of 1955, an item on the editorial page of a small town South Dakota newspaper spoke of the severe drought of the early 1930s and what a field day the cartoonists had with Franklin D. Roosevelt's "wild idea" of planting huge shelter belts of trees. There were timid souls in those days who were afraid of huge projects of this kind. Now, twenty years after the trees were planted in a certain area, a study has been made, and 90 percent of the farmers report that the shelter belt has raised the value of their land, that production per acre has increased markedly, and that they are saving as much as 30 percent in feed by wintering their cattle behind the break. To quote the newspaper: "Never in his highest flights of oratorical fancy did Roosevelt claim as much for the shelter belt program as do the farmers today who have lived with them for twenty years. . . . Boldness and vision paid off twenty years ago. Maybe it is time for some more."<sup>1</sup>

It is easy to hang on to the past. We must not only be willing but also be ready to change. In terms of agency and service arrangements, this means forward planning and flexibility. We must not wait for a crisis.

To recognize change, to be prepared for the shocks that change begets in our entire culture, to bolster the morality—the basic values—that must be used as a measuring guide for the adjustments, and to have the courage and vision necessary to attain the proper degree of those adjustments, the profession of social work needs to recognize both the social needs of the present and social achievements of the past. There are those who say that social workers are constantly talking about needs and gaps and problems and that they fail to recognize achievements and accomplishments. One of my very good non-social work friends twits me frequently with the words: "Isn't anything good being

<sup>1</sup> Huron (S. Dak.) *Daily Plainsman*, October 30, 1955.

done? Is everything bad? Why don't you ever put the emphasis on the positive, on the things that we have, on the good life that exists for so many people?"

It is true that we tend to emphasize the gaps and the negatives of the existing situation, but that is one of our peculiar missions in the necessary role we must play as a profession. We do not expect the millennium here on earth but we know that if intelligence, work, and good motivation are applied to human problems, society can eliminate much human suffering and bring about a greater degree of total well-being.

Let us never sink back into the comfortableness of "Let well enough alone!" Let us never become so immune to people's cares and hurts that we see only the comfortable houses and fail to see the slums, that we are no longer interested in how the other half lives, or even how those in the last percentile live.

Ours is a profession with heavy responsibilities. In a very real way we, and sometimes we alone, stand as the protectors, the defenders, and the helpers of the lost, the last, and the least. It is not an easy role that we have, but we would no longer be worthy to be called a profession if we did not assume our task seriously. Moreover, ours is a dynamic profession with a forward, leadership role, and if we are to practice what we profess we must lead rather than follow, we must ferret out the causes of human ills and attempt to remove them. We have shown in the past, and we must maintain the position in the future, that we are not afraid of the slings and arrows of critics just so long as we are solidly grounded on principles we believe to be sound and just and right. Some of the world's greatest leaders have been the recipients of harsh epithets during their lifetime. Social work no longer cringes under the names of "do-gooders," "welfare-staters," and a long list of other appellations. We are beginning to have confidence in our ability to be helpful to people and to help them make for themselves a better way of life.

Let it be said of us that the whole world is our stage and the welfare of people our concern. Obviously, a profession must develop its own techniques if it is to become proficient and worthy, but let us never lose sight of the fact that these are a means to an end and

never an end in themselves. Let it not be said of our profession that we are overprofessional, narrow, bigoted, self-centered. The professionalism that is truly justified is one that makes common cause with the needs of people. This involves working with citizens as well as with other professional groups. We must avoid closed systems of thought.

Perhaps we are inclined to be too pessimistic about developments and changes and fail to recognize the tremendous and important advances that have occurred in health and welfare. Actually, much has been accomplished in the last fifty years.

18 We have a vast social insurance system, developed in the last two decades, that gives at least minimum financial support to a large proportion of the aged through Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI). Important is the fact that we have gradually expanded the coverage and liberalized the provisions of this program until it now meets minimum standards of protection. Nine out of ten of the nation's workers are now covered by the system. Further changes and amendments are in order and will be forthcoming. This accomplishment is remarkable when it is considered that only fifty years ago social insurance programs were condemned by many sociology textbooks as being "socialistic." And note that the original Social Security Act and most of the subsequent amendments were passed by large majorities of both houses of Congress, many of them, perhaps most of them, enacted on the basis of the needs of people rather than on a political partisan basis.

In addition to OASI we have at least the beginnings of minimum coverage for the risk of unemployed. The unemployment insurance programs in most of our states need considerable liberalization and expansion, but we have made a start and we now have the framework on which to build. Then, of course, we have the workman's compensation programs which in most states predate the Social Security Act by several decades.

9 In our more pessimistic moments we fail to remember that it is only in the last quarter of a century that we have developed a vast system of public welfare services with complete geographical coverage, including five major public assistance programs and substantial provisions to meet the various needs of children. Under the National Mental Health Act we have initiated within the last



decade a program of financial grants and Federal leadership to do something about the major problem of mental ill health. More recently the Federal Government, and to a lesser degree local governments and agencies, has enacted programs to rehabilitate handicapped people and to do something about the increasing problem of delinquency.

Only a short time ago the so-called "welfare state" was political suicide to any party or candidate that would dare espouse it. Today at the national level we find the two major political parties almost competing in promises of maintenance and expansion of existing programs and even promises of new social services. This shift is a recognition of the fact that government has a responsibility and a willingness to make some effort to meet needs. It suggests that public welfare is gradually being removed from the political arena and is becoming a part of basic public policy. The degree and the specific methods are still subject to political argument, but the acceptance of the substantive responsibility is now quite general.

Within the half century our voluntary or private social agencies have built a network of general and specialized social services, some regular and some experimental, that have added greatly to the development of the profession and to the expansion of services to people. We have made tremendous advances in public health, and the life span has been substantially lengthened. Infant mortality and maternal death rates have declined markedly.

Even in research, where we have allowed a serious lag, there are evidences in the last decade of interest, of movement, and in some instances of accomplishment.

In the area of nonfinancial services the voluntary agencies have expanded and deepened the concept of community service to people in need, one great dividend of which not often enough realized, is the voluntary citizen effort that leads to a more sensitive awareness of problems among the more advantaged public. Unhappily, perhaps, the expansion of these services has been limited largely to urban areas.

This is not the whole story. There has been progress in recreation, in working conditions, in housing, in race relations, and in numerous other areas of our common interests.

Let us grant major accomplishment and much success in developing many programs for people in need. Does this mean that we are going to rest on our laurels and sit back with satisfied expressions? Does it mean that the programs which once met the needs still meet them under changed conditions? Does it mean that we as a group interested in the welfare of people are going to be complacent about the many problems that are still unmet or met very inadequately? It is, indeed, worth while to look at history and to study past mistakes and accomplishments. It is easy to get into an argument about events of the past. But as Winston Churchill said in England's fateful year of 1940, "If the present now engages in a quarrel with the past, then surely the future will be lost."

In the present, there are serious gaps in our social services and our social institutions. A sample review of news items over the past year cannot fail to produce a challenge to our profession and to those who would join us in our effort to produce a better life for more people.

21 In November of 1955, the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency stated that "over 1,333,000 children came to the attention of the police in 1954. Almost half a million were brought to the attention of the juvenile courts. This was a 10 per cent increase over 1943 and a 58 per cent increase over the 1948 figures." The committee concluded that this is "far from being a big city problem" and that the increase in delinquency is four times greater than the increase in youngsters.<sup>2</sup>

In the fall of 1955, in New Orleans, it was reported that two children died from eating rat poison which they found in garbage cans while they were looking for something to eat. The neighbors are quoted as saying that they had heard their anguished cries. Without knowledge, much less assessment, of all the factors involved, it remains that this thing happened in the United States of America in 1955 when our food storage houses were bulging to the breaking point.

No more pioneering courses to chart?

In the city of St. Louis within the year, the father of a six-year-old mentally retarded child, after vainly trying to get him into

<sup>2</sup> Notes of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, November 10, 1955.

an already overcrowded institution, abandoned the boy on the street, hoping that he would be found by a patrolman walking his beat. In the state of Missouri we have five- to ten-year waiting lists for the institutional care of retarded children. Who says we should let "well enough alone"?

In this year of 1956, Emmett Louis Till, aged fourteen, who was a visitor from Chicago in the state of Mississippi, was kidnapped, beaten, shot, and thrown into the Tallahatchie River. The newspaper accounts of the trials which followed are shocking to those who believe in justice, equality of rights, and due process of law.

The American Civil Liberties Union reported in October, 1955, that the city of Providence, Rhode Island, refused to accept a statue of Thomas Paine because this hero of the American Revolution "was and remains a controversial figure." The A.C.L.U. rejoined: "If such a historic figure as Thomas Paine can be attacked for being 'controversial,' will other great leaders of our nation who also engage in 'controversy,' even Washington and Lincoln, be attacked?"<sup>3</sup>

Recently it was reported by a Senate committee that in the year 1953, 113,000 nonwhite mothers gave birth to their babies without medical attendance.<sup>4</sup> Large proportions of these mothers were in rural areas and in low-income states.

Even in one of the greatest industrial booms in the history of our country, there are 3.7 million families and 4.4 million individuals with incomes under \$1,000 and 8.3 million families and 6.2 million individuals with incomes under \$2,000.<sup>5</sup> The statement of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the U.S. Congress points out that there are pockets of unemployment and of underemployment and of "depressed economic areas, both urban and rural, which contain a significant proportion of the low-income population—and that as time passes they will contain relatively more of the low income group, unless positive

<sup>3</sup> Jeffrey E. Fuller, ed., "Controversial," *Civil Liberties*, monthly publication of A.C.L.U., October, 1955.

<sup>4</sup> Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 84th Congress, 1st Session.

<sup>5</sup> Report of the Subcommittee on Low Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the U.S. Congress entitled "Characteristics of the Low Income Population and Related Federal Programs," 84th Congress, 1st Session.

action is taken to restore such areas to higher levels of economic activity." The report concludes that in agriculture "region and race thus continue to provide two of our clearest symptoms of the problem of poverty."

In a release of the Family Service Association of America Hugh R. Jones, president of the Association, is quoted as saying:

In a seeming paradox, American families are experiencing greater prosperity and, at the same time, seeking the help of family service agencies in greater numbers than ever before. During 1955, when the nation found assurance in a record 540 billion dollar national output, the 265 Family Service Agencies affiliated with the FSAA counted approximately 1,000,000 persons in the families requesting and receiving counselling and assistance with personal problems.<sup>6</sup>

So in spite of the accomplishments of the past, there are outstanding needs of the present. From an awareness of the past and the present comes the challenge of the future. And the challenge of change must be more than an abstraction or a theoretical concept. At this juncture in history, I consider the following specific challenges vital to a mature and dynamic profession of social work in our changing society:

*The challenge of peace.*—One predominant characteristic of our present era is the effort to develop a world community or an international society of a kind that might bring order and justice in the relationships among people who inhabit the earth. The existing cold war between the East and the West, particularly in relation to the use of atomic energy, is the most significant and far-reaching problem of our time. It may seem somewhat remote to some of us but actually it directly affects us in almost everything we do.

Social workers as citizens must join in assuming responsibility for helping to build a peaceful world, for without that, all other efforts are local and temporary, even futile and unreal. Now, if ever, is the time for us to widen our self-interest and to be concerned about people, not only those in our own communities but people throughout the world. After all, an important segment of

<sup>6</sup> Undated release received March 5, 1956, entitled "More Families Asking Help Despite Prosperity."

the world's population is still hungry. The well-being of the human race is directly related to war and peace.

In addition to our serious functions as citizens, we have professional responsibilities to help promote peace in the world. There are many ways in which we can contribute, each in his own way and in accordance with his position and potentialities. Those of us who are engaged in education for social work can help by stimulating the interchange of students. Some of us are in a position to give technical assistance abroad, particularly in underdeveloped countries. There are many programs sponsored both by governmental and by voluntary agencies. Some can give service to displaced persons or refugees who come here for settlement or who are still isolated in camps in various parts of the world. Still others can participate in, and give support to, the International Conference of Social Work, which among other things serves to bring people from different countries together so that they can learn each other's aspirations. All of us as individuals and as groups can develop a philosophy which puts the emphasis on the human individual regardless of nationality or origin. We can all give support to the continued development of the United Nations, and some can serve that organization in its health and welfare activities.

We can all help to promote the development of a foreign policy on the part of our government which puts the emphasis on helpfulness and negotiation rather than on retribution or solely on force. The competition among the large nations of the world is more than one of arms and atoms, however important that may be. At least equally important is a contest for moral leadership: a competition of principles, of motivation, and of goals. This, of course, means that it is not possible to dissociate some of our domestic problems and practices from our international relationships.

The Communist philosophy is unacceptable to us and is in direct conflict with the basic principles both of social work and of the democratic framework under which we operate as a nation. The best way to compete with such an opposing ideology is to eliminate the delinquencies in our own practice, to bring our

democracy closer to our ideals, and to prove to the world by example as well as by precept that our 166,000,000 people are happy and live full lives. Our system must do more than meet material needs; it must also give to the individual a feeling of genuine self-respect and dignity.

*The challenge of civil liberties and equality of opportunity.*—Those of us who have followed the important domestic events of the past several years are thankful for the system of checks and balances in our government. The greatest strides in race relations—and they have been great—have been made by our courts. The profound and well-managed decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 declaring that segregation in public education is unconstitutional is a climax to a long struggle. We are on the march to freedom and equal rights for all, but the events of the past year, particularly in a half dozen Southern states, offer convincing evidence that the completion of the battle is still in the future. Here, indeed, is a challenge to all Americans, and social workers must share in large proportion the obligation and the privilege of helping. I appeal to social workers and to social agencies throughout the land to give the very best of their intelligence and of their spirit to help pave the way for a rational adjustment of this problem which has faced us for so long.

Social workers in the South have an especially difficult task, but they must not shirk it merely because it has hazards. The members of our profession could supply some of the leadership to work out plans on a state and local basis which would move us toward the goal of equal opportunities for all in a rational and unemotional way. We are trained, to some degree, in the skills to facilitate negotiation, to ascertain all the facts, and to interpret them to those concerned.

I urge social workers everywhere to take a look first at themselves and their own attitudes and I urge social agencies to examine their own practices. We must first put our own agencies in order before we can expect to be helpful in other areas.

The specific desirable methodology to make the adjustment complete is not necessarily the same for all geographical areas and localities. The important thing, as the Supreme Court decision



states, is that we create a direction, a movement toward our goal. While understandably the movement will be faster in some places than in others, we cannot afford to wait too long. Our national conscience and our international relations demand that we give priority to this basic problem of democracy.

Social workers have taken leadership in solving the problems of race relations. Some of you may not know, for example, that in the famous Supreme Court desegregation decision, some of the studies made under the sponsorship of the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth were cited by the Court to help validate their conclusions.

But this frontier will remain until the job is complete, and that means until we no longer have a group of "second-class citizens."

There is a job to be done in other areas of civil liberties. The type of criticism which has been leveled against the Ford Foundation-supported Fund for the Republic is evidence of one phase of the problem. The American Legion action on UNESCO is another. In subtle, but sometimes not too subtle ways, there is developing in this country a climate of conformity and a fear of the new or the untried. Freedom to express oneself and to dissent from popularly held ideas are concepts which we need to support vigorously in the current social scene.

Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme Court in the fall of 1955 publicly predicted that "one of the strongest challenges of the U.S. constitutional system in the next 25 years is the question of whether it can continue to adapt to changing conditions—particularly, in the area of individual rights and national security."<sup>7</sup> He added that our own Bill of Rights is under "subtle and persuasive attack at present" and that "minorities are quick to defend their own civil liberties, but seldom band together to defend the rights of all."

Our challenge, then, is to support the traditional constitutional American freedoms: freedom of speech, of the press, of association, and of conscience. It is, of course, the challenge of maintaining democracy.

*The challenge of improving and expanding our social security*

<sup>7</sup> *Weekly Bulletin of A.C.L.U.*, #1728, December 12, 1955, p. 2.

33 and public welfare programs.—While we have made some important advances on the social security front, our system of insurance, assistance, and nonfinancial services is far from adequate in this changing society. One of the major economic hazards of life, ill health, still does not have adequate insurance coverage. There are two risks, both of which need to be protected by some public provision. One is the loss of wages due to sickness or disability, and the other is the actual cost of medical care during illness. The need rests only partially on the economic results of catastrophic illness. It rests also on the continuous drain on the pocketbooks and the morale of low-income families as a result of many casual illnesses. We need to consider the possibility of a comprehensive social insurance program covering both the loss of wages and the medical cost of illness; or perhaps, as an alternative, the continued growth of public provision for medical care. Because of its controversial nature, this frontier of need requires daring and courage to study and to promote.

Persistent attention should also be given to the existing programs so that modifications can be made to meet changing conditions. We have made commendable progress in the last several decades. Additional changes are presently before the Congress.

Even if we adopt new social insurance programs there will always be a need for public assistance in a mobile and rapidly changing society. Assistance programs have developed greatly in the last quarter century, but much remains to be done. The average grants, particularly in general assistance, are not uniformly adequate; and while the rights of applicants are considered far more now than heretofore, punitive practices still exist.

But let us look at the wider picture of public welfare, which includes not only public assistance but child welfare and other nonfinancial services to individuals and families, as well as to communities.

There is a challenge to the traditional public welfare agencies today to broaden their scope of activity and to be concerned not only with the financial need of people, but with their other problems as well. There is no basic reason why government should not assume some responsibility to be helpful in situations of trouble



that is not purely financial. This is being done in some places of course, but many agencies need to broaden their horizons and focus their attention on whatever needs people might have. In most of our cities many of these gaps are met by a network of voluntary or private social agencies, but there are vast stretches of rural areas that are covered only by public welfare agencies. In some states a broadening of function may require new legislation, but whatever is necessary to bring it about, here is a frontier which deserves our thoughtful consideration. "The welfare of the people is the supreme law of the state."

*The challenge of mental health.*—The rapidity of change which we are experiencing is in itself one of the contributing causes of emotional maladjustment or mental ill health. It is becoming increasingly difficult for even the average person to adjust to the many new situations and to new environments. The combination of wars and cold wars with their attendant anxieties, increased mobility, the growth of individualism with the resulting instability of family life, large-scale and rapid changes in folkways and mores, the pressures of a competitive economic system with its prevailing values—these and many other factors combine to complicate adjustment to contemporary life. 27

In the 1954-55 annual report of the Menninger Foundation, Dr. William C. Menninger points out that mental ill health afflicts everyone at some time and to some degree. He says that there are now about 750,000 persons in mental hospitals, as large a number as in other hospitals combined. Moreover, he estimates that half of all patients of general practitioners are mentally disturbed and, moreover, one of every sixteen persons in this country has personality problems that keep him "from enjoying a useful, effective, and satisfying life." From other sources, we learn that the number of first admissions to hospitals for the long-term care of mental illness rose from 106,000 in 1931 to 171,000 in 1951, an increase of more than 60 percent.

Some emotional disturbances are minor and some have reached the acute stage, but in both cases there are things to be done, both by way of prevention and of treatment. There is a vast shortage of professionally trained psychiatrists, social workers, psychologists,

and other mental health personnel to grapple with this problem.

The Federal Children's Bureau, the Child Welfare League of America, and other agencies have indicated that there are large deficiencies in available professional services to severely maladjusted children. We have barely scratched the surface in an attempt to do research on the possibilities of either curing or preventing mental ill health. Of the \$2 billion we spent on mental ill health in 1955 only one half of one percent was spent on research.

But there are evidences that we are beginning to take hold of this problem and give it the relative attention that it needs. As Dr. Menninger points out in his report, the professional people can "furnish some guideposts," but the big job is one for all of us who wish "to make this topsy-turvy world we live in a better and a saner place for ourselves and for our children." There is a relationship between mental illness and the social and economic milieu in which we live. The attack on this problem, then, is threefold: provision of more adequate facilities for treating the mentally ill person; adjustment of our social and economic institutions so as to reduce anxiety in modern life; and a heavy emphasis on research.

*The challenge of working with others toward common goals.—* There is a need to develop closer working relationships with other groups and professions. We can be helpful to them and they to us. A better understanding of each other's functions and resources could well improve services to people.

Let me cite one example: religion and the organized church. The great religions in our Western culture have much in common with our profession. Basically, we all believe in the sanctity of the individual personality, and our common goal is a more useful and happier life for each person. The unquestioned difficulties should not make us shy away from the development of a mutual understanding of functions and more effective reciprocal relationships. Organized religion has resources which can be used in social work in the treatment of individual patients or clients, and it has tremendous potential power to effect social reform. Likewise, our profession has resources which can well be used by the church.

Early reluctance to enmesh ourselves in this type of relationship

has been due probably to our zeal to develop a young profession and to build professional standards. This is understandable, but have we not arrived at the point where we no longer need be defensive? Are we not sufficiently secure now to dare tackle problems formerly evaded?

I would caution against any approach that would be narrow or sectarian. Regardless of our affiliation, or lack of it, with an organized religious group, I think most of us would agree that spiritual resources are important to the well-being of people. Our literature supports this affirmation. In *Personality in the Making* there is a chapter entitled "Religion as an Aid to Healthy Personality Development." I quote one of the concluding sentences from this chapter: "What we mean to say is that, for the society as for the individual, maintenance of ideals is central to the purpose of individual happiness and responsible citizenship." <sup>40</sup>

Religion is only one example. There are many other groups with which we need to promote more effective relationships. We need to get together with employers and unions in relation to the employment of handicapped people; with psychologists, to work out our respective functions, particularly in agencies in which we both work; with the press and other channels of communication, so as more accurately to have our services interpreted; with those engaged in education, to work out common problems; with our legislators and public officials, if for no other reason than to develop mutual respect for each others' motives. This list is meant to be only illustrative; it could be expanded greatly. The time is ripe to do something about this frontier of developing helpful relationships with other groups.

*The challenge of automation and mechanization.*—The advance of technology continues to be so rapid that words like "automation" are being used in the everyday conversation around the cracker barrel. It is a problem that has long been with us but, due to the acceleration of the rate of change, one that now deserves far more attention than heretofore. <sup>50</sup>

It has been said that mechanization is the situation in which

<sup>8</sup> Helen Leland Witmer and Ruth Kotinsky, eds., *Personality in the Making* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 162.

machines do a man's work whereas automation is when they do his work and control their own operations at the same time. Though in slightly different form, the problem exists both in rural and urban areas.

A leading automobile manufacturer installed automated machines in his engine assembly line. It is estimated that there is a saving of 25 percent in the assembly costs of producing engines. Out of every 200 men, 50 are displaced by this new automatic process. It is reported that in one of the four automated Ford plants in Cleveland "rough engine blocks enter an assembly line and go through 530 different cutting, drilling and milling operations, emerging 14½ minutes later as finished products without the touch of a man's hand." \* New machinery is moving into the nation's coal mines. It is reported that work crews are being cut from seventeen men to seven or eight.

These are only samples of what is happening in American industry. The same process of mechanization is taking place in agriculture. With fewer people we can produce vastly more units of goods. The results of such a great progress in technology are far-reaching, both for the present and for the future. Automation means large-scale displacement of workers, which necessitates important changes in our social and economic institutions. Add atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the needed changes become even more important.

As machinery displaces manpower in industry, we need to give serious thought to the possibility of changes in the workday and workweek, to the development of more effective leisure-time activities, to retraining programs, to new work opportunities, to changes in the methods of paying for work on a longer time basis, to changes in vacation periods, to opportunities for earlier retirement, and to an increase in our standards of living. Some such adjustments must come if we are to avoid a heavy human cost of unemployment and misery.

In the last fifty years the productivity of the average man has multiplied threefold. If we repeat this increase in the next fifty years, the current average family income of \$5,000 can be raised to

\* St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, January 1, 1956.

\$15,000 if we manage well.<sup>10</sup> However, quantity of material goods alone does not in itself assure a full life.

In a speech to the Kansas City Council of Churches Kermit Eby said: "Man's ends are not defined in the volume of goods and services his industrial machines produce. Instead man's ends lie in the quality of life that increased leisure makes possible."<sup>11</sup> As social workers we can well underscore the phrase "quality of life," for that indeed comes within the framework of our interests.

*The challenge of suburbia.*—Population movements are important to social work planning. Our services need to be located where people can use them.

In practically all the great metropolitan areas of the country there has been since 1900 a significant movement of population from the central areas of our cities to the suburbs. While this movement of population began around the turn of the century, it has been particularly marked during the last twenty-five years.

In the decade from 1930 to 1940, the increase in population of central cities was 5.1 percent, whereas for so-called "satellite" areas it was 15.1 percent.<sup>12</sup> In the 1940-50 decade, the percentage of increase for central cities was 13 percent, whereas for the satellite areas it was 34.7 percent. Since 1950 the discrepancy, if anything, has widened.

So we find ourselves with groups of people who frequently live in the suburbs and work in the central city. Quite apart from the many problems of physical planning which these population movements bring about, there is the problem of reorganizing, rearranging, or relocating health and welfare service activities. Success in this undertaking requires imagination and flexibility. Old organization methods do not always fit the new situation.

In the field of recreation and social group work, to take one example, a small suburb of 3,000 people cannot support programs given by three or four national or local autonomous agencies. Moreover, such an arrangement would be wasteful and extrava-

<sup>10</sup> See Yale Brozen, "Automation: Creator or Destroyer of Jobs," *Iowa Business Digest*, XXVII, No. 2 (1956), p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, September 4, 1955.

<sup>12</sup> Stuart Alfred Queen and David Bailey Carpenter, *The American City* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953), p. 107.

gant. Does not such a situation call for cooperation among several agencies and among suburbs?

Racial segregation in health and welfare is not justified in any situation but even less so in a small suburb where the possibility of setting up two separate services is completely uneconomical and untenable.

Here is a frontier that requires rational forward planning by all agencies, but particularly by councils of social agencies and social planning councils and federations.

*The challenge of a changing population composition.*—In addition to population movements, there is the important phenomenon of a changing population composition.

"On the morning of May 27, 1955, the population indicator in the main lobby of the Department of Commerce Building in Washington, D.C., registered 165,000,000—a figure which only ten years ago the Census Bureau believed would not be reached before the year 2,000 if ever."<sup>13</sup>

Completely reversing a previous trend, the rate of population increase in our country turned upward in the decade 1940-50.

In 1954 there were 4,076,000 births in this country, and the number increased in 1955 to about 4,100,000. "About 26 million people have been added to our population in the past ten years, a larger number than in the preceding twenty-one years."<sup>14</sup> The forecasts for population increases in the next several decades are even more startling.

Of the 166,000,000 people in the country today about 55 million are children under the age of eighteen, and about 14 million are sixty-five years and over. This means that something over 40 per cent of our population are in the generally nonproducing early ages of life or in the age bracket which, in our culture, is considered to be the age of retirement. This unusual situation is a result primarily of the sustained postwar high birth rates and the increased life expectancy at the other end of the population scale.

Now what does this situation mean to the people's health and

<sup>13</sup> *Teachers for Tomorrow*, the Fund for the Advancement of Education, Bulletin No. 2, p. 7.

<sup>14</sup> "Large Population Increase in 1955," *Statistical Bulletin*, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., XXXVI, No. 12 (1955), p. 1.



welfare? Broadly speaking, it means that even if we give the same relative quantity and quality of service to children and to the aged as we have given in the past, the services for these groups will have to be expanded greatly. Specifically, it means more teachers and school buildings, more child guidance clinics and child welfare activities, more pediatric and geriatric service in medicine, more recreation and protective services for both groups, and so on.

We are talking here just about numbers and how the change in numbers will bring large demand upon our efforts. This is quite aside from the fact that services to both of these groups in the past could hardly be considered completely adequate in relation to modern standards. This population phenomenon may mean many adjustments in the relative emphasis of agency programs. Locality by locality it is something that needs careful study by all.

*The challenge of prevention.*—We have done a good job in evolving method and techniques in the treatment of pathologies—individual illness, maladjustment, and need. To a large degree our efforts have been concentrated on treatment, with lesser emphasis on preventing the ills from happening in the first place. Is there not work to do in the area of attempting to prevent mass poverty, large-scale family breakdown, widespread juvenile and adult delinquency, mental illness, handicapping conditions?

We have made more headway perhaps in the prevention of mass poverty through such programs as social insurance, the minimum wage, low-cost housing, establishment of adequate wage scales and working conditions, and so on, than in other areas, but even here more work needs to be done, especially in certain segments of our population, such as in rural areas, the South, and among minority groups.

A caseworker who is trying to give facilitative help to a client or patient may find that restoration of self-maintenance or normal living is not possible by treatment on an individual basis and that the only way that person can be restored to health is by the provision of some nonexisting community service, or a change in some social institution, or the availability of resources quite outside the person. If this situation is common in quite a number of our

cases, does the caseworker, or the agency, alone or in concert with others, make an effort to remedy the fault or to avoid the problem in the first instance? Many, if not most, of the pathological situations can be averted or prevented at least in part by proper planning and foresight. But this takes a long view and a wide horizon.

50 In an excellent issue of *Medical Social Work* Dr. Gerald Caplan, of Harvard University, points out that we ought to widen our circle of interest from the mother-child relationships to the father, to the siblings, to the grandparents, to the school, and to our whole social structure and culture. He says that the social worker is a "specialist in assessing environmental phenomena." He points out that when we altered our focus "from the social aspects of casework to the intrapersonal aspects of psycho-therapy" we strayed from our "traditional path." He would have us widen our horizons and put more relative emphasis on community planning, for in this way we would have greater "opportunity for expending our skilled work in the most economical way possible at the focal point."<sup>15</sup>

Dr. Caplan thinks that use of the "knowledge of the unconscious implications of overt behavior" need not be restricted to the intrapersonal phenomena but this knowledge and this sensitivity can be used effectively "in regard to the environmental forces which impinge upon people."<sup>16</sup>

Prevention is not necessarily only an activity by itself. To be sure, it includes provision for decent housing, fair labor standards, protection against adulterated foods and drugs, public health measures, provision of income maintenance through such programs as social insurance, and so forth. A preventive approach should pervade all our activities even though our specific job involves primarily individual treatment. In other words, a caseworker should be actively interested not only in his own case load but in all the families and children of his community. If a licensing law for child care agencies will prevent problems from occurring he should be involved directly or indirectly in an effort

<sup>15</sup> Gerald Caplan, "The Role of the Social Worker in Preventive Psychiatry," *Medical Social Work*, IV, No. 4 (1955), 144.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*



to get that law. The same would be true in the case of adoption laws and preventive mental health clinics, to cite but two examples. I would hope that social workers who are working with individual patients or clients would also be interested in the causes of the conditions they are trying to treat and would be involved in some effort to eliminate those causes. We are challenged to continue the zeal of the pioneers of our profession, to maintain an active interest in preventive activities, and not to put all our eggs in the one basket of individual treatment after the ill occurs.

These are some of the challenges that face us. What is the appropriate response to such a complex array both by the social work profession and by its cooperating citizen volunteers?

The challenge of change is a challenge to take a look at ourselves and our institutions on an objective basis and to sort out those things that continue to be effective and those that have outlived their usefulness. It does not mean that we should abandon everything that we have done or stood for in the past.

For example, if the profession of social work is to fulfill its historic mission it must continue to be the conscience of the community. We must never lose that function. It is our job to know the needs of people as individuals and as groups. It is our job to determine these needs on a scientific basis through fact-finding and research. It is our job to interpret these needs to the whole community and to make every legitimate effort to see that the gaps are filled and, if possible, that the ills are prevented.

A businessman several months ago severely criticized our profession for being unrealistic, for always wanting more services, for never being satisfied. Said he, "Don't you people know that the spigot sometimes runs dry?" My response was that if social work abandoned its function of being the conscience of the community, its responsibility of focusing on the needs of people, it would relieve itself of trouble and grief and controversy, but it would be selling helpless people down the river.

It is not the job of social work to play down needs, to blink at them, to cover them up. That would be dishonest to one of our basic responsibilities as a profession. It is true there are at times limits to the expansion of services at a given moment. But I hap-

41  
pen to think that these limits are frequently exaggerated and often distorted. With our actual and potential productive capacity in this country, with our surpluses and abundance, who is there who will seriously argue that we cannot afford to give appropriate service to our maladjusted, retarded, homeless, and neglected children? Or to our dependent aged? Or to the handicapped? Or to the mentally ill? Or to those just in trouble? And if we want to be so very practical, who will seriously argue that we should not spend some money to provide services that will prevent social breakdown, or family disintegration, or human misery of whatever form?

But, in spite of all this, there are certain practical limitations that are present at given times and in given places. Perhaps we have not had enough courage in setting priorities, however difficult this task. It seems to me that professional social workers have much to contribute here, although the ultimate decisions must remain with the people as a whole.

As conditions and needs have changed we have not always had whatever it takes to help do away with an agency that no longer meets a need. Programs of all kinds have a way of becoming institutionalized, and in a changing scene they need to be studied constantly. While social workers have a part to play in such decisions, I want to emphasize that the final responsibility belongs to the whole community or, in individual cases, to a board of directors. We point up the needs, the people make the decisions. This is equally true in public and in voluntary social work.

Life has many responsibilities. The sins of omission are just as unworthy as the sins of commission. Failure to do the things we ought to do, as we have the talents and the means, is a serious indictment of our profession. We must justify the space we occupy.

The road to getting things done is never the easy road, the non-controversial road, the static road. Progress is dynamic and moving. When we reach one temporary goal, we move it forward, seeking though never fully realizing perfection or the ideal. Change itself takes care of that. The ideal under one set of circumstances becomes the laggard under another. A social service

progr  
far sh  
at one  
recogn  
in the  
Suc  
enoug  
row.  
agricu  
temp  
neces

Ne  
in a  
porta  
progr  
now l

Th  
will a  
thing  
card  
that v  
to hel  
brace  
afraid  
horiz

As

Unsw  
dignit  
other  
lenge  
resolu  
our fa  
ister t  
ished  
endea

17 Be  
XXXIV

program may suffice under a given environment, whereas it falls far short of need under another. A program which serves a need at one time becomes useless at another, and we should be the first to recognize that fact and to discard it. Vested interests have no place in this kind of profession.

Such a profession as ours, then, has no place for "let-well-enough-aloners"; for what is good enough today, may not be tomorrow. The little red schoolhouse may have sufficed in a simple agricultural economy, but it no longer meets the needs of contemporary culture. What is a frill at one stage becomes stark necessity at another; it may actually mean survival.

Neighborliness and voluntary giving may have been adequate in a simple culture, but industrialization, urbanization, transportation, and technology have brought basic changes. Mass public programs for the protection of the health and welfare of people now become necessary.

The day of the pioneer is still with us. There are now and there will always be social work frontiers—challenges to be accepted, things to be done, changes to be made, old services to be discarded, new services to be created. We must never let it be said that we are in a rut, that we are failing to grasp an opportunity to help make this world a better place in which to live, that we embrace mere conformity to the detriment of people, that we are afraid. Let our eyes always be directed toward new goals and wider horizons for people everywhere.

As I have said before:

Unswerving in our purpose we go forward to maintain the respect and dignity which is the birthright of every person. Together with many other well motivated groups in our population we shall meet the challenge, which is really the challenge of democracy. We shall meet it resolutely and with courage. We shall strive to the utmost to maintain our faith in the sanctity of the individual personality. We shall minister to the sick and to the depressed, to the hungry and the impoverished, whether of the body or of the mind or of the spirit. We shall endeavor to make ourselves worthy of our trust.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Benjamin E. Youngdahl, "Social Work at the Crossroads," *Social Work, Journal*, XXXIV (1953), 113.

## *Has the Structure of Social Work Become Outmoded?*

by AGNES E. MEYER

WE LIVE TODAY in a frightening new world created by the physicists. We are not aware of what Robert Oppenheimer calls "the changes which have unmoored us from the past." We have not caught up in our thinking with the changing pace and scope of change itself. The questions those of us who are concerned with the quality of life must ask ourselves, are these: Why does the steady impoverishment of the individual continue despite the enrichment of the community resources at his command? Must we continue to drift helplessly into the depersonalization of a mass society? Or can we expand our vision rapidly enough to counteract this trend and lay the foundations for a new civilization in which the unique and integrated personality can flourish again?

35 To accomplish this, our prime need is a science of society as capable of transforming society as the natural sciences have transformed our concept of the universe. The problem of human relations thus calls for an advancement of the human mind comparable to what the physicists have achieved in the last fifty years. We need an Einstein of the social sciences. But before this genius can appear on the scene, years of patient research and its synthesis must lay the groundwork out of which creative genius can grow and encourage the unprecedented boldness of thought which resulted from Einstein's leadership in the realm of physics. To lay this groundwork, the experts in the behavioral sciences, the social scientists, and the social workers must achieve the same cooperative endeavor that animated the various scientific experts who split the atom.

At present, personal frictions, group frictions, and international frictions are the chief causes of human unhappiness and unrest. A science of society would not necessarily heal all these frictions. Yet they are daily becoming more acute because we are not using research, reason, and intelligence to analyze and clarify the underlying factors.

Why have we been so slow to bring to bear our accumulating scientific insight into human behavior on social problems? Largely through fear; for the scientific attitude demands faithfulness to whatever is discovered and steadfastness in adhering to truth. Thus the general adoption of the scientific attitude toward human affairs would assuredly bring about revolutionary changes in morals, religion, labor-management relations, and politics. So the world drifts along, clinging to all kinds of outworn orthodoxies. We have allowed technological progress to undermine human relationships. Yet we still resist the no less inevitable changes that must take place in our social ideas if the destructive effects of technological progress are to be arrested and a new sense of wholeness created through membership in a society which has recaptured some degree of organic unity.

I see no profession more strategically situated than social work to guide us out of our present confusion and to point the way toward new institutions and a new, more orderly society in which a free, stable, and efficacious individuality can come into being.

How, then, must you proceed to achieve the high role I envisage for you in building the future America? Social work has advanced in less than fifty years toward general acceptance as a profession. For the enormous progress you have made in so short a period, and for the services you have rendered in every community, your profession deserves the gratitude of the nation. At the same time, I think you will agree with me that you no longer produce the outstanding leaders of the old school who were interested in basic over-all planning. How has this come about? When social work began, its objective was to meet all human needs. Then came a great upsurge of population and a technological revolution which uprooted our people, transformed our society from a rural to a predominantly urban civilization, and

43

42

brought about a steady dehumanization of life. Your responsibilities became so heavy and so complex that you were forced into specialization. Lay leaders were also influenced by this trend and changed their interest from problems of the people as a whole to an interest in special categories of children, youth, old age, and so forth. The usual professional rivalries were created among the social work professions together with a rat race for status, which is characteristic of the older professions. This atmosphere of competition is not favorable to the production of the earlier type of leadership, which was dedicated to the task for its own sake. The same process, to be sure, took place in nursing, medicine, education, and law. Our country no longer produces enough dedicated individuals because our competitive culture does not respect them. Anyone who loves a modest job for its own sake, or puts the welfare of the nation above his own interests, is considered a fool, a crank, or a dangerous radical. The predominant American ideal is "everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost." If the Western world is dying of mental and emotional malnutrition, it is largely because few people are willing to renounce personal ambitions and assert their ideas of right and wrong, come what may. Never were Emerson's words more true than today: "It is rare to find a man who believes his own thought or speaks that which he was created to say." While the Communists reveal a willingness to die for their ideas, however wrong, we Americans reveal an unwillingness to live for our ideas, however right we know them to be.

To no profession is this imitation of our cultural emphasis on success at any price more fatal than to that of social service. Things have come to a point where you not only want to compete for prestige with the older professions but with the most important of our existing institutions. Some of your leaders have said to me: "It's time you stopped fighting for education and came back where you began—in social work." Now, in fighting for more and better schools, I was never conscious of being out of the sphere of social work. Those words surprised me. It is this segmental thinking that you must overcome. How can you fail to realize that our poor schools are creating more problems in moral, mental, and

emot  
extra  
conce  
come  
binec  
as the  
comb  
—the  
Team  
of the  
psych  
and l  
useful  
must

In  
probl  
feels  
transl  
than  
rapid  
the in  
see th  
type o  
of con  
the ne  
suicid  
the yo  
roses,  
dren.

If t  
gropin  
now g  
every  
has le  
expan  
of eac  
We p



emotional instability than you can ever cure? Your intramural and extramural professional rivalries must now give way to a new concept of your position in the community. As you can never become educators, psychiatrists, doctors, lawyers, and judges all combined in one fallible human being, you must see your key role as the focus or clearinghouse of all the professional skills whose combined efforts must be brought to bear on our major problem—the creation of an orderly community within an orderly society. Teamwork of this nature is now being developed for the care of the individual—of the mentally ill, for example, where doctors, psychiatrists, nurses, psychiatric social workers, and other social and lay workers combine their efforts to restore the patient to a useful life in the community. It is this kind of teamwork that must now be applied to local, state, and nationwide problems.

In no other way can we now cope with the avalanche of serious problems which arise from the social chaos in which the individual feels helpless and profoundly unhappy. Our society has been more transformed by the technological revolution in the last fifty years than during all its previous history. The tempo of change was rapid, and for years we were so unaware of its repercussions on the individual, the family, and the community that we failed to see that new concepts of social work, new methods, and a new type of leadership were necessary to grapple with the complexities of contemporary living. We are paying for this failure to anticipate the new needs of our society in a mounting rate of alcoholism and suicide, a constant increase of serious crimes, especially among the young, the shocking number of mental breakdowns and neuroses, of narcotic addiction, broken homes, and neglected children.

If the moral disintegration of our people is to be arrested, the groping and fumbling of public and private welfare work must now give way to more intelligently planned cooperative action in every community. The trend toward specialization in social work has led to such an emphasis on individual treatment and to the expansion of so many professional groups working independently of each other, that nobody is responsible for the family as a unit. We prate about the sacredness of the home, yet in only a few of

56

our largest cities can the disintegrating family receive counseling on its total problems. The aged can go to no central point to get comprehensive advice on housing, health, and recreation. The workers left stranded when a factory cuts its production schedule or suddenly moves to another site can find no single agency which can help them solve their problems. With automation right around the corner, who is prepared to take responsibility for the unemployed it may leave in its wake?

16 At the Federal and state levels the trend toward specialization in social work also had a harmful impact. For neither on the state nor the Federal level is there a department with responsibility for the problems of society as a whole. There is at present no Federal department to serve the family. Nobody is more aware of this than Charles Schottland, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is now trying to establish the Social Security Administration as a combined welfare unit comparable in structure and purpose to the Public Health Service. This would, in turn, lead to a coordinated welfare unit at the state level. Then the Federal and state welfare agencies could study the whole situation and develop an over-all vision instead of continuing their fragmented approach to our mass problems.

18 The best example of efficient and cooperative Federal-state community administration is the Department of Agriculture. What social work needs is the equivalent of that department's county agent, to whom the local farmers can come with any problem they cannot solve and get the best and latest ideas on scientific methods of agriculture. To reassure the states and the local communities that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not seeking to dominate the welfare field, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would do well to appoint a permanent Citizens Advisory Council with representatives from business, industry, labor, women's organizations, the schools of social work, and other groups concerned with the need for social progress. The private welfare agencies should unite and establish a similar Federal Advisory Council in Washington to cooperate with that of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.



In other words, social work must be coordinated at the grass roots but it also needs intelligent guidance filtering down from the Federal Government to the state and to the community to set standards which will provide leadership for the local agencies, both public and private, and to encourage the vast army of volunteer workers who are now struggling as best they can to bring order out of chaos in every community.

To accelerate the development of thoroughly studied, nationwide plans for the improvement of human relationships and the reorganization of community life, we need far more research into the historical evolution which created our present complex society. Our social problems cannot be understood and therefore cannot be wisely solved until their relation with the past and the future is carefully analyzed. There is an amazing lack of literature on this subject. What we need is a broad vision of how we got where we are and what to do about it. The chief function of social work today is not only to repair the damage that has been done but to foresee future changes and to guide them. Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, director of General Motors Corporation's research staff, has said that "the world is in the middle or perhaps at the beginning of a second industrial revolution." Yet our great industrial leaders do not yet realize that they must devote as much research to the social problems which their technological discoveries will create as they now devote to purely scientific invention. The question now is whether we shall continue to drift along as heedlessly as we have ever since the first industrial revolution began at the turn of the century. If not, then the only way to put an end to neutrality and drift is to foresee the consequences of the new forces, such as automation and atomic energy. Then, and only then, can we take action and bring about consequences that are socially desirable. Only when we can observe the connection between cause and effect can we begin to plan and to guide our human destinies. Only by such means can we create a better civilization in which people can form the stable habits which we call "morality."

But the first condition for the solution of our problems is to become aware of their existence and their causes. Since we have

(8)

38

no reliable data and no analyses of these underlying causes, we have no strong impulse to cure the social maladies from which we suffer. The diseases of the body politic must be as carefully studied through social research as we study the bodily diseases. For they are the result of complex forces that are active throughout our country. And we shall never make the rapid, fundamental, nationwide progress that is now imperative unless we do the spadework needed for a program of action that will convince people of its practicality and capture their imaginations for its implementation.

The schools of social work should take the lead in establishing research departments. They are in the best position—especially those connected with a university—to call upon the social scientists to get out of their ivory towers and apply their knowledge to concrete problems. We must break down the wall that exists between practice and theory, between the laity and the professional social workers who are trying to solve our community problems, and the know-how and the know-why that exists in abundance in our colleges and universities. Too many of our most gifted social scientists, like the sailor on the ship, have a consciousness of complete independence of land affairs and not a little contempt for the poor earthworms that cannot escape from them. Why all the struggle for academic freedom if that freedom is not going to be used to preserve the freedom of mankind? If the schools of social work are to give the nation the leadership it now needs in a critical analysis of our present society and in the projection of constructive plans for its improvement, they must enlist not only the services of the social scientists but the cooperation of the other professions—the teachers, doctors, psychiatrists, and psychologists—that are now each going their own way in every community.

Through careful research, the schools of social work could also gain the confidence and the cooperation of industry and labor, two of the most powerful agents for the rapid advancement of social welfare programs. On the basis of factual information concerning the effects of technological progress on our society, the schools of social work could persuade our industrial leaders that

planning is just as essential in the social field as it is in business and industry, that the social worker is trying to do what the public relations and personnel experts in industry are already doing—establish better human relationships through the application of scientific knowledge.

It is high time that our social workers, social scientists, industrialists, and labor leaders should recognize that their interests are closely interlocked. To be sure, our rapid technological progress has created our social chaos, but it has also produced the increased per capita wealth and abundance of capital without which our social security programs, as well as our public and private welfare agencies, could never have expanded so rapidly. Let's face it: democracy has never been and probably cannot be successful except in countries that enjoy a modicum of prosperity. Indeed, the history of European countries indicates a close correlation between the development of the industrial revolution and the emergence of democratic institutions. Nor should we forget that when our own prosperity was threatened in the depression of the 1930s, the government had to step in and assume responsibility for the general welfare. Therefore, if we wish to remain what we are now, a welfare *society*, and avoid becoming a welfare *state*, the maintenance and extension of freedom will depend on a constantly increasing production of capital and the expansion of industry. If we want so much welfare per head we must have so much production per head.

To be sure, we fall into the communistic fallacy if we believe that rapidity of material development will automatically guarantee the good life. The other fallacy we liberals can fall into is to ignore the material basis essential to human striving. In other words, we and all other countries can have too little as well as too much materialism. Therefore, it is the problem of management and labor, as it is the problem of social work, to establish a middle ground, a social philosophy which aims at a balance between our country's economic growth and the ideals of a humanistic society. Thus our political leaders, our neo-conservatives, and the theologians who shout that we must desert materialism for spirituality, are spitting in the wind. If our idealism has been eclipsed by the

brilliant success of big business, it is due to the timidity and uncertainty of our idealists, and that includes the social workers. If our high per capita productivity has encouraged an overemphasis upon materialism, the trend cannot be reversed by preaching that we must place spiritual ends above material means. Ends and means cannot be separated. Social workers, especially the schools of social work, must now make clear to the country that spirituality and the brotherhood of man can only be recaptured by research into the science of human relations and the experimental utilization of that knowledge in concrete social situations. If you achieve through this research a philosophy of social work and clear-cut plans for its implementation, our highly intelligent business administrators and labor leaders will be the first to recognize the value of such a contribution to the social, moral, and industrial future of our nation.

22 However, this new philosophy, together with the planning toward its realization, must also be clarified to government officials, to the local leaders, and to the American people as a whole. This calls for a new, across-the-board training in our social work schools, which will produce not only social workers but social statesmen. It calls for social leadership that can move easily among all kinds of people—something I can only describe as “social diplomacy”—guided not only by new and definite purposes but by the tact to make those purposes acceptable to the whole nation. For the science of human relationships is also an art. Neither can exist without the other, whether in the plastic arts or in that greatest of all arts, the art of living.

In short, I am asking you to become politicians in the best sense of the term. Now I well know how some of you shudder at the mere thought of involving your newly won professional status with political action. But those of you who despise the political field should remember Plato's warning that “the punishment which the wise suffer who refuse to take part in government, is to live under the government of worse men.” I am not asking the National Conference of Social Work to come out in a body for this or that political candidate. But I do believe that social workers should more actively support or oppose legislation on the state

and Federal level that is beneficial or harmful to social progress. And you should see to it that more legislation is introduced that will further education, health, welfare, and social security.

I do not ask you to be good Republicans or good Democrats. Our two parties are split wide open between liberals and reactionaries. The thing to do is to support candidates who can be relied upon to fight for social progress and oppose those whose record is one of opposition to financial expenditures for human needs. As one who has lived long in Washington, I see far more hope for the future of our country in trying to make the social workers politically minded than in trying to make the politicians socially minded. The politician will always be influenced by pressure groups, and unless you too become a pressure group, their acceptance of higher social goals will be dangerously delayed. The doctors have not hesitated to exert political pressure, but, unfortunately, it is too often used selfishly to protect their own economic interests rather than the public health. The American Medical Association has been led astray by unfortunate leadership. All the more reason, however, why the social workers should demonstrate that their profession is not primarily interested in economic rewards, that you are still free from the compulsion toward financial success which is so potent in the older professions. As the conscience of American society, it is your mission to develop a new type of political leadership and prove that altruistic dedication to the common good is still a force in American life.

Furthermore, in the mass society that our democracy threatens to become, you must learn to use the highly developed techniques of mass communication if you are to succeed in galvanizing the whole population with new concepts of social work and social progress. It is the irony of fate that the new insights of the behavioral sciences are being applied over television and radio with the greatest success by the public relations experts. I am not referring to the public relations men who have done such valuable work in improving the labor and community relations of the companies they serve. I am referring to the so-called "Madison Avenue Boys" who have learned to use our mass media to control, not to enlighten public opinion. These experts apply psychology

more skillfully than the psychologists and influence human motivations more successfully than the psychiatrists. They have now entered the political arena and learned to sell personalities and policies to our mass society with the same skill with which they formerly sold tooth paste. They are a menace to democracy because only the political candidate or the party that is "well-heeled" can afford their exorbitant fees.

What a boon such talent would be if we could persuade these adroit salesmen of ideas to fight for Federal aid to education, for the expansion of social security, or for other health and welfare measures. But there is no money in such service, whereas millions pour into their hands from rich clients who are interested in maintaining the status quo and, therefore, in defeating any progressive political candidate. Why are these "hucksters" so successful while objective, rational leadership which tries to help people think for themselves labors in vain to reach the masses? The love of conformity, of standardization of thought, of running with the herd, is no accident. It is due to the fact that the individual is isolated in our chaotic society. He is detached from the old ties of family and close community relationships by which character was forged in earlier days. Yet new allegiances and loyalties have not been created to take the place of the old. As a consequence, our people are confused and bewildered. They live in a vacuum. They are emotionally unemployed. Unless we can develop a new social leadership that will envisage the dangers inherent in a mass society and will help people achieve their own unique personalities through relationship to a meaningful world, the "Madison Avenue Boys" will soon be ruling the country and even fooling the masses into thinking that democracy still exists. The cult of public relations threatens to replace the science and art of human relations.

There is nothing inherently immoral in these methods of mass communication. Like atomic energy, they can be used for constructive as well as destructive purposes. Shall we let scientific discoveries—whether in techniques of radio, television, and the press, or knowledge of human psychology—be preempted by authoritarian mentalities? If not, we must devise methods by



which the average citizen can learn to weigh the ideas and policies that are conveyed to him hour by hour, day after day.

If we are going to get ahead of the public relations salesmen who seek to impose their views upon the public, the answer lies in more and better education, and in the encouragement of voluntary action from the grass roots upward and from the Federal Government downward. As I said before, the impoverishment of the individual has gone steadily onward in spite of the enrichment of community resources at his command. Even while our people chant in unison "peace and prosperity," there is no peace abroad or at home, and therefore no peace in their hearts. Nor can prosperity help them forget their secret unhappiness and discontent. How absurd to talk about peace even on the home front when the South is on the warpath against the Supreme Court because of its decision on integration of our public schools. How ironical to talk about prosperity when in Detroit alone there are 190,000 unemployed because the automobile industry is curtailing production. In the complex Southern situation there is a crying need for the application of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political science to counteract the emotionalism that may increase the smoldering flames of intolerance throughout our nation. For this crucial problem is merely an acute form of the irrationalism and the group hostilities which exist in every community. Instead of heaping abuse on the South, we should use it as a laboratory for the application of social engineering of the highest quality. If our scientific insight into human motivations and our ability to guide human behavior are not sufficiently developed to prevent local warfare, how are we ever going to learn to prevent international warfare? Our mounting unemployment should be accepted as another opportunity for practical research into individual and family reactions to this sudden reversal in our booming economy. Surely careful, factual, dispassionate insight into the effects of worker insecurity upon the social structure and upon confidence in our system of free enterprise would be welcomed by our industrial leaders, and help them to gain a wider sense of their responsibilities not only to their employees but to the nation as a whole. It would persuade them that the test

15

56

of democracy lies not in shibboleths like "peace and prosperity," but in the quality of human character which it engenders. I see no other profession more strategically placed in the community than yours to bring all its voluntary and professional skills together for research jobs that can heighten the quality of everyday life, and reassert the vital role of intelligence and the trained mind in human progress.

Moreover, if you act as catalysts of our scientific knowledge and defend your findings with ample proofs, then the millions of voluntary workers will get the leadership we so sorely need. Today neither the individual nor scattered groups can fight the battle for social progress with any hope of success. But before you can persuade the American people to accept an integrated program for community reorganization and the improvement of human relations, it must be clearly outlined for them on convincing evidence by social work statesmen who can command their confidence. If it is set forth in exact, simple, and persuasive language, the latent good will of our people will spring into action and transform our mass society into one that satisfies their deep yearning to lead a life of individualistic and meaningful association with family, neighbors, and friends. From such roots a stronger national community could grow, for the quality of our national leadership, whether in public or private life, depends on the educational and moral values of local popular association. Then, and only then, can America lead the way to a new world community. The ferment of this new world community would not only be reflected in more harmonious international relations, but would be reflected back into the local community, broadening the experience of our people and other peoples.

This vision of the high role of the schools of social work and their graduates will take time to achieve. Meanwhile, the individual feels himself insecure and his freedom jeopardized in many ways. Even our social security programs, the strongest single buttress of democracy we now have, are jeopardized by restrictive laws that make them seem a charity rather than an established right. Another democratic right which is enshrined in every state



constitution is that of public education. Yet the public school system is threatened with destruction in several Southern states that oppose the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation. Our own Federal Government has led the way in ignoring our American ideals of justice, legal procedures, and decent regard for human rights in its flagrant security program. These and many other examples indicate that people will get around the law of the land unless the rights of the individual in our democracy gain a more general acceptance.

Therefore, social work organizations might do well to consider the possibility of drawing up an additional bill of rights to dramatize the newly acquired rights of every American in our modern society. I am not proposing that this new bill of rights should take the place of the original one; it should bring those rights up to date. Chief Justice Warren has pointed out that the original Bill of Rights, which underpins the Constitution's guarantee of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," established no new rights but put together in succinct form human rights that in part dated as far back as the Magna Charta. For many years we have been building up new concepts of human rights in our transformed technological society. What are these rights? Their proper formulation would involve as much consideration, debate, and compromise as did the promulgation of the original Bill of Rights. But surely these are some of the propositions that would have to be considered:

1. Equal protection by the law
2. Equal right to the franchise
3. Economic security for all Americans, with emphasis on dependent children, the disabled, the unemployed, and the aged
4. The right to public education
5. The right to public health services as well as to preventive and curative medical care
6. The right to employment regardless of race, class, or creed
7. Equality of opportunity for adequate housing.

Again I repeat that I am not competent to outline all the basic

rights of an American citizen. I am simply indicating some of the major rights that are now being often and recklessly infringed upon.

Democracy is so complex a system that it is impossible to outline an ideology with which to counteract the false but alluring ideology of the Communists. But we can capture the imagination of all free peoples if, instead of repeating generalities about democracy which have been degraded by constant repetition, we draw up a bill of particulars that defines in specific terms the meaning of citizenship and of freedom in our country.

No matter how carefully these new rights are formulated by a representative and competent group of citizens, they will have to be defended as vigorously as the Constitution was defended in the Federalist Papers. For an atmosphere of reaction hangs like a dark cloud over our land. All the more reason, therefore, why men of courage must dispel this prevailing pessimism concerning the future of democracy by asserting and defining the immense progress our country has made toward the strengthening of human freedom and the new rights on which it is based.

In asking the social work schools and organizations to take the lead in drawing up this new bill of rights, I am calling upon you to assume a heavy responsibility—even a dangerous one given the fear of change, of bold thinking and action, that now pervades our country. But in a confused epoch such as ours, it seems to me the supreme task of social workers is not to share the confusion.

I have tried to dispel some of this confusion by emphasizing two objectives which seem to me of major importance to your profession and to its role in the future development of our national culture:

First, I tried to make it clear how and why the future welfare of our country, and indeed of the free world, depends on the development of what I have called the science and art of human relationships.

Second, I tried to sound a call to the social work profession to see itself as the one best qualified to lead the way toward this salutary goal, if it succeeds in establishing a new cooperative approach to the mounting problems of our technological society.

Your profession, which has done so much in the past to strengthen our social structure, is now at a critical period of its development. Do you want to "play it safe" and join the lockstep of the older professions toward respectability and economic rewards? Or do you want to be the yeast that will leaven the lump of the mass civilization our democracy threatens to become? I urge you at this critical period in the nation's history to accept the arduous role of an inexorable critic of our society, whatever the risk may be. I am confident that your profession because of its very youth has the vitality, the courage, and the imagination now needed to arrest the trend toward the depersonalization of the human being and to lay the foundations of a new American civilization in which the unique, integrated, and free personality can flourish again.

## Conformity and Freedom

by TELFORD TAYLOR

THE LATE, GREAT JUSTICE of the Supreme Court of the United States, Oliver Wendell Holmes, was a man who conformed naturally and gracefully to most of the accepted conventions and principles of his time. He was fastidious in conduct, he deeply respected tradition, and he was the epitome of scholarly conservatism in his professional and social outlook.

No doubt Justice Holmes would have scornfully rejected any description of himself as a "nonconformist." Indeed, he was not altogether pleased when, near the close of his long and brilliant judicial career, a book was published, entitled *The Dissenting Opinions of Mr. Justice Holmes*. "It is not as a professional dissenter that I wish to be remembered," observed the Justice as he thumbed the book. And not long thereafter, in deference to his wish, another volume was published under the title *Representative Opinions of Mr. Justice Holmes*.

32  
Certainly this is not the image of a Bohemian in manner or a revolutionary in politics. But does it follow that Justice Holmes was a slave to conformity—to the voice of the majority? On the contrary, part of his greatness has been seen to lie in his steadfast devotion to basic principles as he conceived them, even when this led him to conclusions and pronouncements that were very unpopular. He never flinched from swimming against the current when that seemed to him the right thing to do. And from the example of this great judge, an individualist if ever there was one, I think we can draw a deeper and more precise understanding of the meaning of "conformity" and "nonconformity" and of their relation to the freedom that we cherish as an ideal and as the touchstone of our way of life.

First of all, we must take care not to be misled by the sound of words. Some people like to see themselves as "conformists," while others fancy themselves as "nonconformists." But neither conformity nor nonconformity is a value in itself. As Benjamin Youngdahl has observed, "Change itself is neither good nor bad."

Well, it is the same with nonconformity. Indeed, nonconformity is a purely negative idea standing alone. It becomes meaningful only in relation to conformity. Unless one presupposes the existence of standards to which others are conforming, there is no basis for the concept of nonconformity. In other words, conformity and nonconformity are mutually interdependent, like the *yin* and *yang* of Oriental symbolism. In the language of the "Hit Parade," "You can't have one without the other."

Accordingly, when we think of conformity and nonconformity as human values, we are confronted with a problem of balance. It is absurd to think of nonconformity as a goal to be pursued. Too much nonconformity would make a mess of things very rapidly. But the converse is equally true, for total conformity would mean the stagnation and death of our civilization.

So it is not my intention to extol nonconformity as a way of life, but to discuss its value as one ingredient of human behavior, with particular reference to the goal of freedom. How does nonconformity contribute to the preservation of our liberties? Are they threatened today by the fear of seeming "different"? Is the idea of individual liberty losing its appeal for Americans by reason of excessive eagerness to conform to what is popular? Such questions are the setting for our pursuit of the rightful balance between conformity and nonconformity in terms of our historic freedoms.

Now, there is another common misunderstanding about nonconformity which should be dispelled at the outset. This is the notion that there is some affinity, or common denominator, between nonconformity and political radicalism. In common parlance, a "liberal" is thought to be a nonconformist as compared to a "conservative"; a Democrat more nonconformist than a Republican; a Communist more so than a Socialist. In short, the degree of nonconformity is imagined as getting greater and

greater as one moves to the left end of the political spectrum.

All this, to my way of thinking, is wide of the mark. There is certainly nothing very nonconformist about being a Communist in the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of the most repellent features of Communism, to me, is this heavy, dull mantle of conformity that settles over life in Communist countries.

In many parts of New York City it is very nonconformist to be a Republican; in upstate New York, generally speaking, the reverse is true. And I certainly have known a number of persons who think of themselves as "liberals" who are very uneasy when they find themselves in a minority, and have no stomach for the lonely path of individual dissent. It completely distorts the true nature of nonconformity to equate it with any particular point of view on political or economic questions.

Nonconformity is often thought of as a receptiveness to new ideas. There is a measure of truth in this, for a new idea is by definition a departure from the past. An eagerness to explore new thoughts is characteristic of a flexible and adventurous mind, and such minds more rarely than others fall prey to fears that bind them to the beaten path.

But nonconformity has no necessary relation to what is new. Sometimes the crowd forgets its old gods and runs off to worship the golden calf. More often some wave of popular fear or excitement so grips the public mind that old and cherished values are overlooked. There is, after all, nothing very new about our Bill of Rights. There is nothing novel or original about a due respect for our constitutional guarantees of freedom.

Nevertheless, there have been times and occasions during the last few years when too many people, in the name of national security, have been willing to scrap the constitutional guarantees. Those who, in the face of popular condemnation, have persisted in defending these guarantees have truly been nonconformists. And so, I suggest, nonconformity may often manifest its greatest value, not in the search for new and untried ends, but in preserving old and tested values. This brings us to the heart of our subject—the relation between nonconformity and freedom—and

some examples, drawn from our recent national experience, may be enlightening.

As the power of the Soviet Union has grown, and with it the menace of international Communism, Americans have been increasingly preoccupied with the security of the nation. This concern is both natural and wise. It is right, too, that we should look not only to our defenses against hostile military action from beyond our shores but to those against subversive internal forces as well. In response to this threat the Congress has passed laws and maintained investigating committees, the executive branch has instituted loyalty screening programs and greatly enlarged the security police forces, the state governments have followed suit, and all sorts of civic and semipublic organizations have joined in the development of a nationwide program of loyalty surveillance.

The original purpose of many of these measures is both laudable and prudent. The question is not whether national security and the detection of hostile internal forces are desirable objectives; of course they are. The question is whether we have rightly gauged the danger in relation to the values to which our nation is dedicated. It is my belief that in many respects we have badly miscalculated the matter, and have developed fixations about security that have endangered the very institutions that we are supposed to be protecting. And this, I believe, has been due to a dangerous overdose of conformity. Security, at first a wise precaution, became an emotional fetish, to the extent that many were reluctant to question the wisdom of anything—no matter how extravagant or shortsighted—that was being proposed in the name of security. 29

One of the most pernicious results of this blinding preoccupation with security has been a decline in public respect for law. Our government has always been said to be one of laws and not of men, and from this it follows that men should not be publicly condemned or penalized on mere suspicion or accusation, but only by regular processes of law.

Of course, national security requires that we conduct loyalty investigations, and track down rumors and suspicions, and check the apparent substance of accusations. So, too, some types of public



and semipublic employment are so secret, or otherwise lie so close to the nation's security, that an individual may properly be excluded from these critical areas on mere suspicion—or even, for example, because he has a relative in some other country, through whom hostile pressures might be brought to bear.

But when we are dealing with the ordinary affairs of men—an individual's regular life in the community—the situation is quite different. You may not publicly condemn a man as disloyal, deprive him of the opportunity to work or travel, take away from him rights and privileges common to all members of the community, and in substance outlaw him, without proving to the satisfaction of a court that he has been guilty of some offense under law.

Recently, however, in our preoccupation with security, this basic principle of freedom has been overlooked. Let me give an illustration drawn from the current history of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Massachusetts legislature recently established a Special Commission to Investigate Subversive Activities and Related Matters in the Commonwealth. This commission was directed not only to investigate and report, but also to include in its official public reports: "The names . . . of any individual concerning whom, the Commission, during the course of its investigation, has received creditable evidence that such individual was or is a member of the Communist Party or Communist or a subversive."

I ask you to note two particular features of this extraordinary and vicious procedure. First, the public listing is to cover not only Communist party members, but a vague category of individuals described as "subversive"—an appellation the meaning of which is left entirely to the discretion and judgment of the Special Commission, and which invites the worst sort of defamation merely because of an unfavorable opinion or as a result of nothing more than political disagreement. Second, the General Court's directive envisages that the Special Commission shall make some kind of a judgment that the evidence against an individual is "creditabile" or "credible," whichever word was intended. Thus, by authority of the legislature, judgment is to be pronounced on individuals



outside the courts and in flagrant violation of constitutional requirements.

I do not know what the Massachusetts legislature meant by the expression "subversive," but personally, I would regard as "subversive" any conduct which, in the words of the late Chief Justice Stone, violates "the principle that constitutional laws are not to be broken down by planned disobedience." And a process, such as the one which has now been embarked on in Massachusetts, that seeks to impose derogatory and damaging labels on individuals by legislative pronouncement and with no judicial safeguards, attacks the most vital principles of our form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution, and itself may rightly be described as "subversive."

Now I would like to compare this recent affair in Massachusetts with something that happened there just 100 years earlier. The 1850s were the time of what was called the Know-Nothing party. This ugly movement was the product of social strains and readjustments arising from the tide of immigrants that swept over the eastern seaboard in the early and middle nineteenth century. The reaction was a wave of virulent antiforeign and especially anti-Irish and anti-Catholic feeling, which found political expression in the Know-Nothing party. It was a singularly sterile and primitive aggregation; there was no actual program of any substance, and the movement was essentially a vehicle for the venting of national and religious hatreds.

In the Massachusetts elections of 1854 the Know-Nothings elected the governor, all the other state officers, the entire state senate, and all but three of the entire membership of the House. Never was there more complete political conformity in Massachusetts than during that first year of Know-Nothing domination.

The very first thing this Know-Nothing regime did was to establish a Joint Special Committee on the Inspection of Nunneries and Convents, popularly known as the "Nunnery Committee" or, because of the members' penchant for poking their noses into private places, as the "Smelling Committee." Its appointment was precipitated by vague rumors of "popery" and

44

wild charges by the Know-Nothings that women were being held in Catholic convents against their will.

The Nunnery Committee had a brief but colorful career. After an opening session at Holy Cross, where nothing seemed to be amiss, the committee proceeded, on March 26, 1855, to the Catholic school at Roxbury. Here, according to contemporary records:

The whole party tramped over the school building frightening the children, treating the nuns with little respect, and peeking into closets and corners to find the dread evidence of popery which propaganda writers had convinced them should be there. After thoroughly disrupting the school, the whole party adjourned to an elaborate dinner where champagne flowed freely—although sale of the beverage was forbidden in the State. At Lowell members of the Committee and their friends not only imbibed freely of local liquors, but also charged the State expenses incurring from their relationships with a woman answering to the name of Mrs. Patterson who was notorious for her easy virtue.

This wretched and degrading spectacle was finally checked by the outraged citizenry of Boston. Under the chairmanship of Charles Hale, a committee was established to investigate the Nunnery Committee—perhaps the earliest case in which an investigating committee itself became the target of inquiry. At all events, the disclosures of Mr. Hale's committee led to the expulsion from the House of the Nunnery Committee's Chairman, one Joseph Hiss. And the investigations of the committee came to an unlamented end, despite the overwhelming dominance of all public offices enjoyed by the Know Nothings.

28 This civic resistance to the abuses being perpetrated by a benighted and violent majority was, I suggest, a fine example of nonconformity at its best. A courageous minority restored the moral and social integrity of the community. Massachusetts today would be the better for a resurgence of that sort of nonconforming civic courage, directed against current outrages such as the unlawful legislative blacklisting that the legislature has called for.

The current American scene would readily yield many other examples from the field of civil liberties, illustrative of this relation between conformity and freedom. I will limit myself to one.

In 1954 Congress enacted the Communist Control Act of 1954,

which "outlaws" the Communist party and strips it of all "rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies." It was passed unanimously by the Senate, and by the House of Representatives with only two negative votes.

It is clear that this extraordinary bill would never have graced the statute books but for the fears and pressures generated chiefly by the congressional loyalty investigations. President Eisenhower's administration did not seek this legislation as part of its security program. Attorney General Brownell and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover had publicly condemned outlawing the Communist party as a poor security measure. Governor Thomas E. Dewey and many other eminent men of both parties and many shades of thought were vigorously and publicly hostile.

In these circumstances, the overwhelmingly favorable vote in Congress proves that many, if not most, of the members were not voting their convictions about the bill, but rather had succumbed to fear or a cheap desire to pose before the public as zealous Communist-haters. From my own study of this measure, I am thoroughly convinced not only that it added nothing useful to our anti-Communist legislation, but that it unnecessarily confused and beclouded the legal situation and will be a hindrance to national security. But there is another important consequence to be noted.

The principal effect of the new law will be to ban the public and nonconspiratorial activities of the party, and especially to strike its name and candidates from the ballot in all future elections; already this has been the result in New Jersey. Yet ever since the First World War the keystone of American foreign policy has been to support the right of nations and peoples to determine their own political future by free elections. Since the Second World War, in Germany, Korea, and elsewhere, we have stood forth as the champions of national self-determination by popular vote. We have staked our principles and our prestige on the proposition that, given a free and unintimidated choice at the ballot box, democracy will be the victor over Communist totalitarianism.

What is left of all this, once we abolish free elections ourselves? It is only too easy to envisage the propaganda use to which the

"outlaw law" may now be put by Communists all over the world. Has it now reached the point that East Germans and North Koreans and Vietnamese may be expected to vote for democracy and reject Communism, but Americans cannot be trusted to make the choice? Surely it was worth much for us to be seen as a land where the Communist party is not suppressed by the long arm of the police, but is rejected by the long heads of the people.

This law, now on the Federal statute books, is a horrible example of the fruits of conformity run to panic. Two men only in the House of Representatives—one a Brooklyn Democrat; the other, a North Dakota Republican—dared to stand openly on their individual convictions and vote against the bill. In the manner no less than the fact of its action, Congress debased the legislative process, and the corrupting force was cynical or frightened conformity without the bracing antidote of vigorous dissent.

The freedoms that we are concerned with are no mere luxury. They are part of the means by which we wrestle with the problems that confront the nation. Free and open discussion of public issues, and the interchange and comparison of differing opinions, is part of our political process for making decisions. And if that process is choked by fear, if the loudest or most numerous voices are unchallenged, our whole body politic becomes diseased.

23 I think that in recent years, parts of our apparatus for the conduct of foreign policy have been diseased and paralyzed for just such reasons. The violence of the recriminations about the conduct of our Far Eastern policy in the postwar years has led, I believe, to an atmosphere in which urgent and vital current problems of Far Eastern policy are not being discussed. This oppressive atmosphere has plagued both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles, and has restricted the area of public debate in a most unfortunate manner.

Consider, for example, the difficult question of trade between the free world and the Iron Curtain countries, especially Communist China and Soviet Russia. This is, let us recognize, an area where we do in fact come to grips with the opposing forces of Communism. The "cold war" is a compound of local wars such as those in Korea and Indo-China, of propaganda and other forms

of psychological warfare, of scientific research and intelligence gathering, of diplomacy, and of economic warfare, including, of course, international trade. All these things deeply involve and affect our allies as well as ourselves, and this is especially true of foreign commerce.

But trade is not only a weapon of economic warfare. It is also a vital ingredient of peace and an attribute of peaceful relations among nations. Indeed, in the case of such nations as Great Britain, Japan, Germany, and Norway, foreign commerce is essential to national survival. Furthermore, the currents of international trade cannot be neatly divided by the Iron Curtain; the dependence of Japan on trade with the Asian continent, for example, is historic and well known to all of us.

The Federal Government can control or prohibit trade between the United States and Communist countries. Our government also can influence the volume and nature of trade between our allies and Communist countries. What should our policy be? Obviously, the answer must depend on the most painstaking, perceptive, and tough-minded appraisal—item by item and country by country—of the prospective benefits and detriments to the free world and the Communist world.

I am not so much concerned with *what* the answer should be as with *how* it should be reached. It seems to me that Congress has never quite dared to consider the problem in the cold-blooded, realistic terms that are necessary. There is too much political peril in any suggestion that trade with Communist countries is justifiable under any circumstances.

When we come to the matter of recognizing Communist China, the plane of discussion is even more barren. Our military academy debating teams were not even allowed to consider so dynamite-laden an issue. For some people, loyalty appears to be a matter of reflex rather than reason. Mention China and the United Nations and we are all expected to cry "No" in loud, clear tones, as promptly and unreflectingly as the mouths of Pavlov's dogs watered by reflex action when the bell for food rang. Whatever our views on Communist China, surely they ought to be based on something more than the judgment of the salivary glands.

In the field of national policy, therefore, the fear of controversy may have very damaging effects. The same is equally true of the internal workings of a society. And in this connection I shall draw my example from another land and from another era, not long passed.

In Soviet Russia or, formerly, in Nazi Germany, there would not be much patience with all this talk about the merits of non-conformity. The debates and delays of the democratic process, in totalitarian eyes, are a waste of time, and dictatorship is a much more efficient governmental system.

Large areas of Soviet life are shrouded from the gaze of foreigners, and any over-all judgment of the efficiency of the Soviet system must depend largely on inference and estimate. My own belief is that its greatest efficiency will be found to lie in those very areas that have been farthest removed from the grip of tyranny.

But in the case of Nazi Germany there is no need to guess. The Nuremberg trials and other records of the Hitler era have exposed to postmortem diagnosis the inner workings and results of the Nazi system. And these records show, by profuse and convincing evidence, that in the long run, dictatorship, and the conformity it breeds, is far less efficient than democracy. By the very reason of its total conformity, dictatorship bears within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

Out of an abundance of striking illustrations of this general theme, perhaps the most telling is the decline in the standards of German medicine, as demonstrated in the Nuremberg "Medical Case," which dealt with twenty-odd German doctors accused of performing murderous and inhuman medical experiments using human beings as guinea pigs. One of these experiments was performed for the benefit of the German Air Force which, like our own Air Force, was vitally interested in methods of making sea water drinkable, for use in air-sea rescue work.

The Germans had a perfectly good method for removing the salt from sea water, which of course made the water potable, but this method required large amounts of silver, of which Germany was very short. Another technique had been developed which did



not remove the salt, but only concealed the salty taste. One would have supposed that elementary chemistry would have sufficed to demonstrate that it is the salt and not the taste that makes sea water poisonous to drink. But German medicine had become slipshod in technique, and these doctors careless of human life and insensitive to suffering. So, by direction of the chief of the German Air Force Medical Service, forty unfortunate concentration camp inmates were tortured within an inch of their lives by being made to drink this treated but still salty sea water for a week or more. Performance of this brutal and stupid experiment was delayed for even more stupid reasons: these doctors, supposedly men of science, had fallen victim to Nazi racial myths and debated endlessly whether Gypsies were enough like German aviators that they could be used as test subjects.

It took much time, effort, and staff to carry out this cruel and utterly useless test. Letters had to be written, conferences attended, reports prepared, and physicians, of whom there was a dire shortage in the German armed forces, were taken out of hospitals and sent hundreds of miles to obtain an answer to a problem which should have been solved in a few hours of laboratory work.

But such waste and inefficiency were the inevitable results of the degradation of German medical standards and ethics under dictatorship. The chairs of medicine at many universities had been filled with Nazi party hacks, and medical students had to waste much time in party activities. The scientific spirit was distorted by Nazi racial theories, and medical students' heads were filled with racial mumbo jumbo. Psychiatry, for example, suffered because Freud and other famous exponents were Jewish. One interesting result was that the German Army Medical Service failed miserably in treating combat fatigue because its methods of psychotherapy were ruined by the infusion of Nazi doctrine; this resulted in the surrender of many nervously exhausted German soldiers, and prevented the rehabilitation and restoration to duty of many others.

As it was in medicine, so was it in most other fields of activity under the Third Reich. Conformity stifled the voices that should have been raised against Nazi excesses at their inception. Con-

formity closed the mouths of men of the highest professional and business standing, and finally they found themselves tolerating and even participating in absurdities and atrocities of unimaginable dimensions.

Fortunately, we in the United States have never even approached so low a level of public consciencelessness. But we have recently been going through a period—there are encouraging signs that we are now emerging from it—characterized by considerably more conformity and less nonconformity than is customary with us or desirable for us. This condition, for brevity if for no other reason, needs a name, which may as well be “hyperconformity.” What are some of the elements of life in the United States today that tend to induce a condition of hyperconformity?

One factor, for certain, has been the long-drawn-out, hostile pressure from the Soviet Union. After our long tussle with Nazism, defeated only by massive warfare, we were in no mood for another period of strain. Disillusionment coupled with frustration produced a nervous, angry, and unreflective public temper. The blossoming of nuclear science and the consequent possibility that humanity will now bring about its own destruction spread deep uneasiness and suspicion. Security problems were new to most of us and had not been thought through. Fear of Communism, therefore, is a powerful stimulant of the hyperconformity that has characterized our recent years. However, it is by no means the sole cause. There are striking developments in our economic and social structure that have nothing to do with fear but generate a strong current of uniformity in our daily living. Two such forces are particularly significant.

Thirty years ago the term “mass communication” would have been meaningless to most Americans. Television was nonexistent, radio networks were in their infancy. The press rested on a far more varied and decentralized proprietary base than it does today.

Now, in my opinion, there is nothing in the intrinsic nature of television that begets conformity. Nevertheless, and due to circumstances that are almost accidental, television and radio have both developed on an economic basis which is quite new in the field of communications. I refer to the fact that both are almost



completely dependent for their revenues on commercial advertising.

I am no enemy of advertising; it has brought many extraordinary things into our lives. But I do not believe that the radio loudspeaker and the television screen should be the creatures of advertising. Newspapers, magazines, books, and movies are not. It is obvious that they are and have been far more flexible, varied, and individualistic media of public expression than radio or television. If you are aiming at the mass market, as radio and television do, you line your sights to what is currently popular. This is not wicked; it is simply human nature. But certainly the silver screen in the home does not generally cultivate the original, the controversial, the unpopular, the "off-beat." The world of mass communication is a conformist world. 44

The same is increasingly true of the world of industry and commerce. The woes of the small businessmen and small tradesman today are not purely economic. They are social and cultural as well.

I have always thought that the unending debate between the partisans of "bigness" and "littleness" in economic organization overlooks the true issue. "Bigness" is not intrinsically bad, as should be apparent above all to the inhabitants of this land where the advantages of large-scale production have been so magically exploited.

The risk is rather that the big trees will shut out the sunlight from the ground from which new trees must grow, and that our economy will ossify and be frozen into a rigid pattern which excludes all newcomers. This risk is fundamental to any analysis of freedom; for conformity and timorousness will surely spread rapidly in a society where one can work only for the government or for a big corporation and has no other choice. Woodrow Wilson forty-odd years ago stated the impact of economics on freedom, in language as clear and apt for 1956 as for 1912:

There has come over the land that un-American set of conditions which enables a small number of men who control the Government to get favors from the Government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal business opportunity; by those favors to extend a network

of control that will presently dominate every industry in the country, and so make men forget the ancient time when America lay in every hamlet, when America was to be seen in every fair valley, when America displayed her great forces on the broad prairies, ran her fine fires of enterprise up over the mountain sides and down into the bowels of the earth, and eager men were everywhere captains of industry, not employees; not looking to a distant city to find out what they might do, but looking about among their neighbors, finding credit according to their character, not according to their connections, finding credit in proportion to what was known to be in them and behind them, not in proportion to the securities they held that were approved where they were not known. In order to start an enterprise now, you have to be authenticated, in a perfectly impersonal way, not according to yourself, but according to what you own that somebody else approves of your owning. You cannot begin such an enterprise as those that have made America until you are so authenticated, until you have succeeded in obtaining the goodwill of large allied capitalists. Is that freedom? That is dependence, not freedom.<sup>1</sup>

I have spoken in terms of conformity and nonconformity, but these words fall short of the meaning I have sought to convey. Perhaps there are no better words within my grasp. The bees and ants have marvelously intricate and highly organized societies, and it seems to me that Communism and other forms of totalitarianism lead us toward that sort of regimented insect life. Democracy seeks to foster individuality within the ever more complex fabric of human society. In this quest, conformity and nonconformity express the delicate balance that must be jealously safeguarded.

What does this mean in political terms? We do not have today an oversupply of leaders who venture to swim against the current. But that is what must be done when the alternative is to be swept over the edge of the cataract. Courage is nine-tenths composed of the prudence that can foresee the hard consequences tomorrow of taking the easy course today.

We have small need today of governors whose signatures, jurists whose opinions, and legislators whose votes are glued to the path of least resistance. The cemeteries are sown with the forgotten bones of men who held but were unable to dignify high office. Our greatest need is for public servants whose sense of values is

<sup>1</sup> Woodrow Wilson, *The New Freedom* (1912), quoted in Helfner, *A Documentary History of the United States* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1952), at pp. 221-22.

inner-directed, and whose goals rise above the mere leaving of a bland taste in the public mouth.

It is often said that a nation gets the leadership its people deserve. And if what we need are leaders who dare to walk alone, we must have a public temper that respects independence and individuality, and understands the value of controversy and dissent. We have enjoyed and benefited by that atmosphere in times past, and it is high time that it be revived.

53

values  
50  
44

## *The Real Tragedies of Desegregation*

by CARL T. ROWAN

12  
28

SOME OF YOU have walked through the slums of the North side of Minneapolis, or the South side of Chicago, or Fourth Street in Nashville, or those festering eyesores of other American communities. You have cringed at the filth, the crime, the disease, the abject human misery of these places, and you have paused to ask yourselves, "Why must this be?"

Others, perhaps, like myself, grew up under the shadow of Jim Crow in little towns where they could not get a drink of water in a drugstore unless the fountain clerk could find a paper cup. Facing these lingering acid stings of humiliation, they too have said so many times, "Why must this be?"

Oh so many more of you have known, firsthand or with the secondhand intimacy of a sweetheart, wife, or mother, the terrible agony of war. So even as you suppress memories of those days when we read about the beaches of Tarawa and Heartbreak Ridge in Korea, however much we try to forget these bestial manifestations of man's inhumanity to himself and his fellow man, we must stop to ask, "Why must this be?"

Still, so many of us cringe timidly and close our eyes to the turmoil about us although we know deep in our hearts that mankind will be plagued by filth, crime, disease, hatred, wars and rumors of wars until you and I show the individual courage to meet this challenge of change.

Today the status quo has pleasant meaning only to the fearful and to those frightful merchants of arrogance who live under illusions that the world will stand still at their bidding. The forces of change beset us from every side, but nowhere is this challenge greater or more meaningful than in those areas where we seek

to insure for all Americans those basic rights and liberties supposedly bestowed upon us by our God and our Constitution.

The United States Supreme Court took a meaningful step in this direction on May 17, 1954, when it declared unanimously that racial segregation in the public schools of this nation is illegal under our Constitution. That was a monumental decision destined to have severe impact upon American society, and upon the future of Western democracy. No other single incident in the history of this nation ever was seized upon so voraciously by this nation's propaganda experts who used millions of words and pictures to tell Asians and Africans that Americans had found a cure for the nation's Achilles' heel.

How happy I should be were I able to tell you that vast millions in the nation's Southland have responded nobly, if reluctantly, to this challenge to forge a new social order reflecting credit on democratic institutions. As a reporter, I cannot do that. There are too many things that distress me. Now, I do not want to be accused of adopting that old newspaperman's slogan, "Good news is no news," so let me say briefly that on the whole the Negro is a freer citizen who finds the pursuit of happiness something closer to an even race as a result of that May 17 decision.

Even with the heavy penalty it is paying for the discriminations of the past, Washington, D.C., is a vastly different city from the citadel of bigotry that I wrote about in *South of Freedom*.<sup>1</sup> St. Louis is considerably different from the bastion of Jim Crow that I knew when I made several visits during the Second World War. In West Virginia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Texas, and several other states human beings have reached inside themselves to stifle the fears and frustrations of old, and they are giving us indications of the capacity of democracy for change.

But I should be doing you and my country a disservice were I merely to read off a scorecard of the communities that have decided, for one reason or another, to obey the highest court in the land to one degree or another. I feel it a compelling duty to share with you my grave alarm that while we sit back rejoicing over the "good things," that while we salve our guilty consciences

<sup>1</sup> New York: Knopf, 1952.

by telling ourselves that we are making progress, those very cherished freedoms so vital to all Americans will be damaged or destroyed in an unrelenting, unscrupulous assault by peddlers of hatred.

I see so much danger that while you, the thinking Americans, the supposed sentinels of liberty, are being swallowed up in a cult whose creed is gutlessness in the name of moderation, the forces of bigotry and reaction will strike some very damaging blows at the heart of this republic.

Now, I beg you to understand that I do not speak to you as a Negro. Of course I was disturbed by the murder of Emmett Till; I was distressed by the fact that a mob forced Miss Autherine Lucy out of the University of Alabama; it bothered me deeply to learn that those Negro ministers had been arrested in Montgomery, Alabama. Still, I cannot speak to you as a Negro. Perhaps I could have done that in the years before I went to Asia and Africa and gazed into the agonized faces of mankind in upheaval. Today I speak not of *my* rights, but of *our* rights and liberties.

45  
Preying upon the fears and emotions of much of the white South, and far too substantial a portion of the white North, those elements in this country which always have opposed social and economic change now have set out to discredit and destroy the United States Supreme Court.

Almost a year ago—May 26, 1955—James Oliver Eastland, a Mississippi senator, stood in the Senate and declared that the Supreme Court was “indoctrinated and brainwashed by left-wing pressure groups.” He charged that the justices are “attempting to graft into the organic law of the land the teaching, preachments, and social doctrines which can be traced to Karl Marx.”

The Jackson (Miss.) *Daily News*, which calls itself “Mississippi’s greatest newspaper,” said in a front-page editorial that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People “is dedicated to widening this wedge, which was handed them by a subversive Supreme Court.”

*U.S. News and World Report*, whose editors are a trifle more clever, if no more enlightened, than those of the Jackson newspaper, published in its May 18, 1956, issue a long cover article by

James F. Byrnes titled, "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed." This is a burdensomely long rehashing of Eastland's charges that the Court is Communist influenced, that it is forcing mongrelization upon the American people, and that the trend in the Court "brings joy to Communists and fellow travelers."

Let us assume for the moment that none of us is severely disturbed about the status of the Negro, that we are indifferent at best when it comes to working for compliance with the Court's decision. We then can look at these attacks on the Court in the broader perspective of what they mean to all Americans. I say that you and I had better understand that if the segregationists succeed in this campaign to discredit the Court, they will do far more than doom Negroes to more decades of second-class citizenship. They will make this a country in which life is scarcely worth living for either a white man or a black man nurtured on long traditions of freedom of expression and belief.

When they discredit the Supreme Court they discredit the body that interprets our Constitution, the wellspring of all our political freedoms. When they destroy the Court they destroy the body that decides what the Bill of Rights means to all of us. They seek to destroy the group of men who for the last few years have symbolized the bulwark of individual liberty, standing boldly between bewildered Americans and the witch hunters and scalawags who posed as saviors of the republic.

Do you think I overstate the case? Most of you probably recall that at the recent convention of the Methodist Church in Minneapolis, a Negro, J. Ernest Wilkins, was elected president of the Judicial Council—the highest lay position in the Methodist Church. A Montgomery, Alabama, white man was elected vice president.

Recently, at a meeting I attended in New York, another Alabama white man who is a close friend of the man elected vice president of the Judicial Council told me of his serious concern about the inroads on the freedoms of white men in Alabama. He told me that his Methodist friend was a Christian and a decent man who never would have had any objection to serving as vice president on a body where a Negro was made president. Indeed,



our Alabama Methodist, who happens to be the superintendent of schools in Montgomery, accepted the position of vice president and went home. It was then that the White Citizens Council, which has all but taken complete control of the state of Alabama, put pressure upon this man and the members of the school board and forced him to resign as vice president of the Judicial Council of the Methodist Church. Perhaps you think I still overstate the case.

Well, do you remember a senator named McCarthy? Joe's his name. Joe Doaks caught up with him, just as he catches up with all demagogues if time lasts, and discovered that he was just a clever hack preying upon the insecurity and ignorance of Americans. So Joe McCarthy faded into obscurity and, frankly, I thought he had died. But on May 11, 1956, Eastland held a session in Washington in which he constituted himself as a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and his star witness was none other than Joe McCarthy. Their objective was to rap Eastland's favorite target—the Supreme Court. The two issued a joint statement charging that the members of the Court are "politicians instead of lawyers." "It's not that they are knowingly helping the Communist cause. It's just that they don't understand what they are doing," said the two great patriots, referring to the nine justices.

I do not think any of us is so naïve as to think that any nine justices would have escaped the wrath of the unyielding segregationists. Yet, more is necessary than the absence of naïvete if we are to meet the challenge of change.

I checked my files just before leaving Minneapolis, and I counted twenty-six white ministers who have been forced from their pastorates, some with fanfare, some quietly; some by the moblike clamor of churchgoers, others by the quiet, dignified pressure of people like the governor of the state—all because they dared suggest that the Supreme Court's edict be obeyed.

It has been learned that twenty-four Negro teachers in Elloree, South Carolina, have refused to sign statements swearing that they are not members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

At about the same time, in Jackson, Mississippi, the state's "Sovereignty Commission," or its "watchdog" over states' rights, voted to hire secret agents to serve as "eyes and ears" in the fight to keep segregation. This commission, headed by the governor, J. P. Coleman, also agreed to spend state tax monies to "buy information" about activities in the integration camp. This commission decided to act in secrecy because "it's possible we may want to hire a Negro" to spy on Negroes in Mississippi.

The most significant comments of the day, though, were these sentences the governor used to caution Mississippians against panic: "I see no reason for alarm, frustration, or futility. We have the ball, and it's up to the opposition to take the initiative. After all, integration came about because the people gave up. We will not give up."

So it is up to "the opposition" to take the initiative. The opposition would be the Supreme Court, the Justice Department, and all the Americans who honestly believe that our Constitution is color-blind. But what are these Americans doing? For the most part, they are mouthing platitudes and clichés. Oh, you've heard them all: "These are times for cool heads to prevail"; "If only we could get rid of the extremists on both sides"; "We've made a lot of progress in the last century—a little more time will help"; "We must have patience"; "We cannot solve this problem overnight"; "I believe in evolution, not revolution"; "We mustn't go too fast or we'll set progress back 100 years."

Those are all nice, sweet little syllables, but what do they add up to? You know and I know: cowardice.

How much time and patience will it take to make Coleman voluntarily yield the initiative, as he puts it? Whose head is cool enough to feed those Negro teachers who would rather not work if it means yielding their last vestiges of constitutional freedom?

How many of you remember President Eisenhower's State of the Union address in which he asked Congress to set up a bipartisan commission to investigate charges that in parts of the country Negroes were being deprived of their basic rights through economic reprisals, and so forth? This provoked the *Jackson Daily News* to run another front-page editorial. This one said:

12

28

Those who suspected we had that kind of President in the White House when he named the ignorant, fat-headed Fred [*sic*] Warren as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to write the ignoble "black Monday" decision on segregation have had their suspicions verified.

Dwight Eisenhower, in his race for president in 1952, received a very large vote in Mississippi. Today he couldn't command the following of a corporal's guard in a race for constable in any county in the commonwealth.

The President has earned, and justly deserves, the contempt of all good people throughout the South . . .

Any commission named by him would be about as "bi-partisan" as a hog gobbling rotten guts in a swill trough.<sup>2</sup>

Those words, from the Jackson *Daily News*, are intemperate and ugly with the mark of man's fear, and I should prefer not to have to quote them. But these are not times to be squeamish. We must face the ugly truth, and we must ask ourselves if we have clichés that apply with equal merit, or demerit, to people striving as best they can to solve these tense social problems and to those people of unlimited arrogance and gall, such as the writer of that editorial. Tell me, what sense of justice permits an editorial writer to place the writer of that editorial in the same so-called "extremists" camp with an NAACP official whose strongest demand is that the people abide by the Supreme Court's decree that there be "a prompt and reasonable start" to end segregation?

Too many supposedly decent and enlightened people go about today in confusion, victimized by deliberate falsehood and, more often, by the meaningless clichés of spineless men who seek safety as middle-of-the-roaders. Well, even some of our politicians are going to learn that the worst accidents happen in the middle of the road.

If I sound angry or dogmatic, I ask your forgiveness. I feel these things intensely nowadays, for I have spent most of the last two years in two worlds of revolution—Asia and Africa. There I saw firsthand that millions of human beings have risen up and that they cry out in voices of unmistakable clarity, saying: "We intend to be free. We intend to be masters of our own fates. We intend to make the decisions affecting our own lives."

<sup>2</sup> January 7, 1956, p. 1.

I need not impress upon you the fact that those decisions will affect far more than the lives of Asians and Africans, but yours and mine and our children's, and our children's children's. I do want to impress upon you the fact that the most explosive ingredients in this Asian revolution are anticolonialism and antiracism. To the Asian and African, these two things are interrelated, for both are viewed as manifestations of the white man's organized arrogance.

In far shrewder ways than we possibly can imagine, the Communists know how to use these two ingredients to convince these millions, groping for a place under the sun, that you and your fellow Americans are phonies when you tell them that a position of equality awaits them under the banner of Western democracy.

Many will tell you that these millions cry out for rice, for houses, for education. Indeed, they do—but the deeper, more meaningful cries are for dignity. The Asian and the African are begging for boldness; they must have evidence that our system stands for more than the status quo, that ours is not the voice of "freedom for you sometime in the sweet by and by," if traditions of individual liberty are to be preserved in these two crucial continents.

So when the next cliché peddler tells you that you must "understand the South," agree with him to the extent that he acknowledges that *we all* must understand our Constitution, our concept of justice, our role in a world where the destiny of mankind is wrapped in doubt and strife.

How tragic it will be for us all if we cannot, or do not, take steps that will enable the Negro to keep faith in the processes of democracy. If the Negro cannot achieve justice through the courts; if a band of politicians and Main Street Klansmen can reduce to an impotent shambles the constitutional machinery that the Negro has kept faith in for four decades, then who can look toward Asia and Africa and say with conviction, "Have faith. The capacity for change, for progress toward full justice are inherent in democracy."?

Mine is not the voice of despair. I am not one of the wilting hearts who trembles at the roar of the demagogues who now muster their Citizens Councils in cotton patches and beneath weeping

willows; I am not one of those namby-pambies who cry, "Ooooh, I wouldn't have wanted that Supreme Court decision if I had known that it would start all this trouble."

Let no one tell you that we have moved backward because of the Supreme Court decision. Missouri will tell you better. So will Kansas. In the deep South the decision merely has brought to the surface the turmoil that always has rumbled quietly in the shadow of Jim Crow. It was absolutely essential that this turmoil arise and that it be met and dealt with before any really significant strides toward real democracy could be made. No really significant social change ever occurred anywhere at any time without accompanying upheaval.

So all the ugliness, the angry words, the frightening schemes, soon can be but strange and laughable history not too many years from now—but only if we have the courage to meet the challenge. *If* we meet the challenge—yes, wisely always, but never compromising on principle; never assuming that time alone is a cure for anything. Only if America's social workers sense personal involvement and then take personal action can we have any hope that the liberties our forefathers secured for us are resecured for future years and generations.

If yours is the honest knowledge that you have the courage to strip away the clichés and the little platitudes of cowardice, and step forward boldly to meet our generation's greatest challenge of change, then our fears are small, whether we think of home or of those troubled areas abroad. Boldness and courage in the town you live in is fuel for the torches of freedom in the many dark corners of the world.

But if you rationalize your way into some imaginary middle-of-the-road security because you know that, deep inside, you too are a slave to the status quo, then you have many, many reasons to worry. Whether we speak of Minnesota, Georgia, or Jakarta, freedom always has been in danger for cowards—and for the arrogant.

## *Desegregation and Integration in Social Work*

by SAVILLA MILLIS SIMONS

THE GREAT PROBLEMS growing out of social change which confront us in this country are part of world-wide historic movements that we cannot stop or reverse. They have been developing over many years, but have rolled up on us with tremendous force as the result of the stupendous technological changes of recent years. These changes have been so rapid that they have pushed us with almost unbearable insistence to slough off old habits of thought and attitudes about people—both people in other countries in faraway villages with unpronounceable names and people in our own communities, often newly come from some other part of the United States.

All over the world there has been a rising demand for better living conditions and, even more important, for greater recognition of human dignity. Especially in the newly independent countries, and in the poorer countries that are striving so hard for economic development, men and women living in extreme poverty are asking for a better life for themselves and for their children. They want enough to eat and safe drinking water; they want to learn to read; but even more urgently they want respect and human dignity.

As a result of the breathtaking developments in science and technology of recent years, especially in atomic energy, we see the possibility of doing away with poverty. If we avoid war, fabulous possibilities for improved welfare lie ahead. We have moved into an era where, as the economic pressures for a minimum standard of living ease up, we are increasingly concerned with the quality

of opportunity open to people. Our goal now is not so much the adjustment of the individual as it is his opportunity for full self-development. In social work we are confronted with a problem more subtle and more complicated than economic security; it is one of working for human dignity, individual dignity, identity as a person, and fulfillment in a mass society.

43 Part of the struggle for human dignity that is going on all over the world is the process of desegregation and integration occurring in this country. This is a national problem, not a sectional one, even though its character varies in different places and under different circumstances.

I am using the terms "desegregation" and "integration" to describe a process of change to a system of organization with no distinctions or restrictions based on race. "Integration," as a more evaluative term, describes a process of achieving a more positive quality of human relationships. Desegregation is an essential prerequisite to the process of integration. It is, however, a more limited and short-run objective, whereas integration is a continuing process of group adjustment.

Social change is always a highly disturbing and painful process, but also one that gives hope. Social work was born out of social change. It has a function in helping people to adjust to social change and it is also itself an instrument of social change.

Social work is inevitably involved in an active role in the process of desegregation and integration for the following reasons:

- 42
1. Our convictions as to the worth of the individual, and our commitment as social workers to work for the self-fulfillment of the individual and increased social well-being, require it as a matter of conscience. Our American heritage as typified by the pledge of allegiance that reads "with liberty and justice for all" also commits us as citizens to be concerned with removing barriers that exclude any group of Americans from full citizenship. Furthermore, most of us are committed by the teachings of the Judeo-Christian faiths that all men are the children of God. And so professional, democratic, social, and religious beliefs compel us to remove the gaps between these beliefs and our actual practices.



2. As social workers we are concerned with the effects of exclusion, discrimination, and segregation on individuals. It is of particular interest to social workers that the Supreme Court decision of 1954 took into account the findings of social scientists, based on recent progress in the field of psychology and mental health, concerning the harmful effects of segregation on the personal and social development of children.

3. Social work agencies as an important part of the social fabric and community life cannot isolate themselves from social change of so significant a character. They inevitably have some kind of effect, good or bad, on the process of social change.

4. Social work has insights and skills that help in the process of change and ease the adjustments involved. Surely the basic social work principle of "beginning where we are" gives us a base from which to start in any situation or community, and the social worker's understanding of the dynamics of human behavior gives guidance in the processes of desegregation and integration. This, of course, means acceptance of differences among communities and agencies as to where and how they initiate the process and the speed with which they move toward the goal.

Twenty-five schools of social work that were good enough to write me on this subject were in general agreement that social workers have an obligation to work for integration in social work agencies and professional organizations. Some suggested that, in addition, social workers should work as citizens in community education and action programs.

What, then, has actually been happening in social work? What progress have we made toward our goals?

In assembling some information, I have had the cooperation of many agencies and individuals to whom I am greatly indebted, especially the Urban League and the United Community Funds and Councils of America, Inc., which undertook special inquiries, and the Committee on Intergroup Relations of the National Social Welfare Assembly. Although fragmentary, this factual information may help to throw some light on the part social work is playing and might play in the movement toward greater integration. This information shows that during recent years there has

been a slow but forward movement toward greater integration of boards, staff, and services to individual clients and to groups.

28 Evaluative comments on the progress of integration in private social work agencies, as measured by membership of Negroes on boards and committees, employment of Negro staff, and integration of services, were received from fifty cities throughout the country. In the large majority of these communities it was felt that some progress had been made during the last five years. Mentioned most frequently were the addition of Negroes to agency boards and committees and increasing employment opportunities for Negro staff in agencies. In a number of cities it was reported that there were not enough Negroes ready to accept available positions on boards. This fact suggests the desirability of conscious planning to meet this need. The scarcity of trained Negro staff was also referred to, generally in cities with a small Negro population. In thirty-one cities the campaign for chest funds among Negroes is now conducted as part of one united drive. Three of these cities have moved from separate to integrated campaigns within the last five years.

The majority of community councils or planning committees and, to a lesser degree, community chests in all parts of the country have Negro board members. Usually between 15 and 40 percent of chest agencies in Northern cities have some Negro members on their boards. About half of the councils and chests employ Negro staff, more often in nonprofessional positions; a few, but a growing number, employ Negro professional staff members. One fourth of 1,200 member agencies in chests in 40 cities for which we have reports employ some Negro staff.

In cities outside the South in general the larger number of the chest agencies provide integrated services. In Southern cities, the common pattern among all types of agencies is to provide separate services for Negroes.

Analysis of the material shows very clearly that community organization plays a key role in this situation, and that councils of social agencies and chests have an important influence. In several of the communities where there had been greatest progress, the councils or chests had adopted official statements of policy which

helped member agencies and the social work community to move ahead together. To mention only a few instances where the council has given such leadership:

As early as 1946 the Welfare Federation of Cleveland adopted a strong "Statement of Principles for Interracial and Intercultural Relations" covering the responsibility of the Federation, the professional schools, and the agencies and commended it to all member agencies. This was followed in 1950 by an implementing statement of the Group Work Council, and in 1956 by a statement of "Suggestions for Practice in Developing Intercultural Relations in Group Work."

More recent examples show the effect on social welfare of desegregation in the schools and, in turn, the role of social welfare in helping to prepare the community climate necessary for successful school integration. In St. Louis, one of the outstanding examples of successful school desegregation, there has been notable progress in the last few years in social welfare. Two years ago the Social Planning Council adopted a statement of goals which made the democratic acceptance of clientele on a need basis one of the criteria for membership of agencies in the Council.

In Kansas City, Missouri, where integration of the schools has moved rapidly and well, the Council of Social Agencies adopted a resolution in February, 1955, to encourage "each member agency to eliminate all racial discrimination from its practices, to work toward the total and purposeful integration of this board, staff, program and membership; and to serve all persons in equity without regard to race or color."

Baltimore, with strong leadership from welfare and civic leaders as well as from school officials and with the outspoken support of the Governor, was one of the first cities to integrate its schools after the Supreme Court decision. In anticipation of the decision, community agencies had organized a coordinating committee to mobilize public support of, and assistance to, the schools in desegregation. It is also of interest that workers from welfare and human relations agencies made home visits in neighborhoods where there were severe tensions over desegregation. There has been considerable agency movement in desegregation, especially in rec-

reational and educational agencies, which were also affected by the Supreme Court decision in 1955 that ordered desegregation in parks and in public recreation. Following a community-wide self-survey on intergroup relations sponsored by the state and city Human Relations Commission, the Baltimore Council of Social Agencies in March, 1956, sent a letter to its member agencies stating its belief that nonsegregation at all levels of board, staff, and services is the ideal toward which all agencies should strive, and urging agencies to examine their practices in the light of this policy and to take appropriate steps to achieve the goal. This action reflects a general climate which has encouraged agencies of all kinds to move ahead. The Housing Authority of Baltimore City as early as June, 1954, successfully put into effect a desegregation policy in its low-rent public housing program.<sup>1</sup>

There is no doubt that clear-cut assumption of leadership by councils or chests in enunciating desirable policies is very important in freeing agencies to move, and in providing a favorable climate for action.

29 National agencies also influence progress. They have a responsibility to give encouragement, guidance, and support to their local affiliates as they face problems of integration. They, like the councils, help to set the climate for integration by example and the setting of goals and policies. An inquiry made in October, 1955, by the National Social Welfare Assembly on practices with reference to segregation in meeting places for conventions and conferences showed that twenty-six of the twenty-eight national agencies replying have interracial national meetings and that they will hold national meetings and training institutions only in cities which furnish equal accommodations to all participants. On consulting eight of the major national case and group work agencies as to their policies on desegregation, I found that all of them have taken steps over a long period of time to encourage their local affiliates in their efforts toward integration. Of this number, five group work agencies have written national policies calling for

<sup>1</sup> An example of particularly effective preparation was given by the Baltimore Housing Authority in desegregating its public housing program. The Authority carefully worked in advance with its staff, the tenants, and all possible neighborhood and community contacts, including the law enforcement agencies.

nondiscrimination in membership. In a variety of ways they have been studying their progress in interracial practices and working on methods of implementing the national membership policy.

In general, the settlements have had an open membership, and for more than ten years one of the criteria for membership in the Federation of Settlements has been that an agency must serve all people in its neighborhood with no discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or nationality. The YMCA, which has long been concerned with this problem, at its annual Council meeting in 1954 adopted a resolution urging all member Associations "to work earnestly toward the elimination of segregation and other forms of racial discrimination."

The YWCA, has been working toward integration for many years. In 1926 the Student YWCA's and YMCA's held their first interracial conference. Since then they have continued to work to eliminate segregation. Following a study of interracial practices in local community Associations, the YWCA at its national convention in 1946 adopted its Interracial Charter and specific recommendations to local Associations covering all aspects of local administration and operations. In 1949 the national convention pledged that "the YWCA would work for the integration and full participation of minority groups." At the 1952 convention, in recognition of the world responsibility of Americans and the urgency to practice the democracy we preach, a significant resolution was adopted on the International Implications of the Interracial Charter. At its last triennial convention the YWCA voted that each local Association and the National Board should review its progress toward inclusiveness since 1946 and decide on specific forward steps to be taken. "A summary of effective experience is to be reported to the convention in 1958." All over the country local Associations have taken further steps in recent months. An Association in a Southern state, during the past year, has desegregated all its operations, including its residence and cafeteria.

What have social work agencies been doing to work for integration in the community? On the whole, there seems to be less clarity about this aspect of social work's responsibility, but there have been notable examples of social work making this kind of

contribution. To mention only one, the American Friends Service Committee, through helping the community accept the change, made an extremely valuable contribution to the successful integration of the schools in Washington, D.C. The Committee used the seminar method to prepare teachers, students, citizens groups, and members of the Boards of Education and Recreation and of child-serving private agencies. In cooperation with United Community Services, seminar invitations were issued to board members of private agencies which were still segregated but considering changing their policies. The Committee assembled data about experience elsewhere in the country to meet requests for information and advice about innumerable specific problems. When the Committee terminated its project at the end of four years, there were strong leadership, specialized services, and widespread community efforts to complete the job.

There have been many instances of social workers undertaking social action in this field, but we must bring our professional insights and skills to this area of community action more vigorously if we are to make our full contribution to what Benjamin Youngdahl has called a "rational adjustment of this problem which has faced us for so long."

All of us recognize, however, that the translation of ideals and policies into actual practice is fraught with difficulties and calls for great wisdom, understanding, and skill. How are the schools of social work helping to prepare social workers to further the process of integration and to work in integrated situations? In general, the schools believe the student is prepared by his total experience in the school; by the attitudes and practices of the school itself, and by the total curriculum. Many of the schools have an interracial student body. The School of Social Work at Washington University in St. Louis was integrated before the University as a whole accepted integration. One Southern school reported that as part of a seminar for advanced students there was discussion of what citizens and social workers can and should do to promote integration in that part of the country.

Nathan Cohen, in his splendid address on "Desegregation—a Challenge to the Place of Moral Values in Social Work Educa-



tion," at the 1955 meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, pointed up how essential it is for the schools to provide a climate for learning democratic values and the important place of social philosophy in social work education. In some instances, agencies have had their first experience in integration when a Negro student has been placed in the agency and carried responsibility for white cases. In some situations, the schools, through their field work placements, help prepare agencies and the community for integration in personnel and services.

What are the implications of our experience for effective ways of working? I should like to summarize what seem to emerge as important requirements in taking forward steps toward integration in social work:

1. To examine our own anxieties and fears from which stem prejudices, and to have a real commitment to definite ideals and goals that will serve as a motivating force.

2. To recognize, because of the dynamics of human behavior, that reaching these goals is not easy.

3. To begin at the point where the agency or community is, accepting differences in attitudes and point of view and adapting the strategy to the local mores and habits of thought and the particular conditions. This may imply possible differences in speed of accomplishment, but no differences in ultimate goal.

4. To establish some timetables in order to assure forward movement.

5. To evaluate conditions objectively and make careful preparation in advance of action, assembling facts, establishing principles, getting agreement between board and staff on objectives and ways of moving.

6. To announce a clear and firm statement of policy and take appropriate action with balance and courage.

7. To make full use of professional knowledge and skills and a disciplined use of self.

8. To use interracial leadership in a team approach in planning and carrying out program.

9. To change attitudes by providing opportunities for meaningful experiences in face-to-face contacts which will permit growth

41

54

53



through relationships. Even where residential segregation results in segregated group activities, intergroup activities can be arranged.

10. To build interracial experience around a common task or interest, not solely on the principle of being interracial.

11. To start new projects and programs, such as those in suburban areas, on a basis representative of the composition of the community.

In the present situation, with seriously aggravated tensions in some areas, it is of the utmost importance to keep channels of communication open between white and Negro Americans. Social workers can help to meet this urgent need.

I have mentioned particularly the responsibilities of social work for integration in social work agencies and for assisting integration in the larger community. We must not forget our continuing responsibility as citizens to build a favorable public opinion and to reduce tensions.

The carrying out of our role as social workers calls for infinite understanding, wisdom, fortitude, and courage. It may, in some instances, involve serious sacrifices. But social work can do no less in a time of dynamic change. Social work must do its full part in resolving the tensions within this country that, if they remain unresolved, may help to destroy freedom everywhere and, perhaps, civilization itself. These are tensions that must be resolved if America is to do its part in the world scene in preserving freedom and the kind of peace in which we can work for our objective of a good life for all people.

## *Labor and Social Welfare*

by JOSEPH A. BEIRNE

MORE AND MORE am I impressed with the fact that social work and organized labor share a great many common objectives. Our methods, our approach, our techniques, may differ, but we are both primarily concerned with the well-being of people. As organized labor and social work continue to develop as great institutional forces in American life, it is obvious that our common goals must lead to wider areas of cooperation.

The AFL-CIO is a new organization which happily has inherited many great traditions. For more than a century our labor unions have consistently defended and advanced all of our country's cherished beliefs and institutions. In most quarters the merger of the AFL and the CIO has met with great enthusiasm. A few voices—mainly those that have consistently opposed progressive, social, and economic programs—have called the merger a "labor monopoly." As most of you are aware, the AFL-CIO is not a collective bargaining agency at all. It is a federation of autonomous national unions. It has neither voice nor vote at the bargaining table. It can order no strikes. These matters are within the scope of the national unions alone and the locals affiliated with them. This was so when the AFL and the CIO were separate. It has remained so since the merger. Why then the cry of "monopoly"? I suggest that one powerful reason is the clear recognition by those opposed to social progress that the AFL-CIO will be an effective force behind many programs that are in the public interest. The AFL-CIO will seek to improve education, social security, housing, and national security, not for our members alone, but for the total American community.

We of organized labor learned long ago that we cannot solve our

8 problems as workers unless we work with other groups in the community to find solutions to the basic problems of all the people. This principle has guided our relationship with social work over the past decade and a half. The AFL-CIO in its constitution created the Community Services Committee. This committee was charged with the work of stimulating active participation of our members and unions in community affairs and developing sound relationships with social agencies. The Community Services Committee has adopted a statement outlining ten principles based on our past experience in working with community agencies:

1. The union member is first and foremost a citizen of his community.
2. The union member has a responsibility to his community. He must cooperate with his fellow citizens in making his community a good place in which to live, to work, to raise children. He must be concerned about the availability of adequate health, welfare, and recreational services for the whole community.
3. Unions have a responsibility for the health and welfare of their members and their families which extends beyond the place of employment. This responsibility includes not only the emergency caused by strike, unemployment, or disaster but extends to helping the member meet his day-to-day personal or family problems.
4. The community has a responsibility to its citizens. It must be prepared to meet those social needs which individuals or families cannot meet or meet adequately with their own resources.
5. Unions have elected to finance, support, and participate in existing community social service agencies rather than to establish direct social services of their own. To the degree that the personnel and facilities of social agencies serve all the people, they serve the men and women of organized labor, and unions shall be encouraged to continue this policy.
6. Government has the basic responsibility for meeting the broad health and welfare needs of the people.
7. Voluntary or privately sponsored social agencies and facilities occupy an important position in meeting the social welfare needs of the community. Major responsibilities falling within the scope

of voluntary social work are in the fields of character formation, child guidance, family counseling, and youth activities, as well as in the area of experimentation and pioneering research.

8. It is the responsibility of organized labor to cooperate with other community groups in improving the quantity and quality of social services, while at the same time educating union members about available health and welfare services and how to use them.

9. Assistance in whatever form should be given on the basis of need, regardless of the cause of the need and without regard to race, color, or national origin.

10. Prevention of social problems is preferred to the best treatment of social ills.

These principles reflect the approach of organized labor to social welfare in America today. They suggest the road organized labor will follow in reaching our objective of a better community for all.

One of the major commitments of the AFL-CIO community services program is to equip as many of our members as possible to assume their responsibilities to the community. Through the union counselor training program our members become familiar with the purpose and work of community health and welfare services and facilities. Counselor training courses help union members to develop a wider and deeper understanding of social welfare problems and of the resources which are available.

A second objective of the AFL-CIO community services program is to promote the intelligent use of public and voluntary welfare agencies and the services they offer. The union counselor in performing his function as referral agent is frequently the link between the union member with a family or personal problem on one hand and the best source of community help on the other.

A third objective of our program is to encourage and equip the union member for service in community affairs. Board membership in health and welfare organizations affords the opportunity for citizen participation in policy-making and agency-planning; it strengthens community understanding. For itself, the AFL-CIO seeks no special consideration other than the opportunity to serve. To the degree that social agencies represent the total community, they represent the men and women of organized labor.

418 In addition to board membership, AFL-CIO members serve their communities in a number of ways. They are blood donors, volunteer drivers for the handicapped, leaders in the local scout troop or settlement house; they serve as readers to the blind, hospital aides, foster home parents, and civil defense workers; through their trades and crafts they contribute their skills to many community programs.

A fourth objective applies specifically to the support of voluntary agencies. We encourage our members to contribute through programs of federated fund-raising to democratically operated, worth-while community health, welfare, and recreational agencies.

A fifth objective of the community services program is to motivate our members to work with other community groups in realigning existing social services to meet needs as they arise, or to create new agencies and facilities to meet unmet needs.

These objectives are clearly compatible with the best interests of social work, and at the same time they serve also to strengthen the democratic process and to create the moral climate that encourages social progress. Labor's participation in the field of social welfare underscores an assumption which we have always held dear—that our human resources are the nation's most valuable asset. We should like nothing better than to be able to work constructively with all segments of American life in fulfilling the great promise of democracy. In its community services program, organized labor has created an effective tool for action at the community level on the many social problems which demand solution, and we are convinced that solutions can be found if men of good will are willing to work together.

The labor movement, furthermore, has been and will continue to be concerned about the publicly supported social welfare programs. Organized labor has played an important part in shaping some of these programs. We helped get the basic social security law on the books. We have consistently favored the extension of the law and we have defended it against those who would destroy it.

Today, the social security program is accepted as an integral

part of the fabric of American life. We are all aware how profoundly the social security system has altered the concept of social welfare from one of giving relief and service to the underprivileged, to a dynamic concept of promoting the well-being of individuals and families. We have made a good start through our program of social insurance in giving millions of Americans at least a modicum of protection against the major economic hazards of life. Moreover, this protection is given in a manner which enhances the dignity and self-respect of the recipient because he receives his benefits without a means test, and as a matter of right. 18

At its first convention, in December, 1955, the AFL-CIO looked at our present social security program and declared its support in favor of "comprehensive expansion and improvement of the existing system of old-age and survivors insurance to provide adequate benefits as a matter of right to the aged, the permanently and totally disabled and those suffering from temporary disability or accident."

At this very moment we are battling for social security coverage for the permanently and totally disabled. Many in this category are covered by public assistance, which has not done an adequate job. The number that would be eligible under the social security program is not large—only 250,000 the first year, rising to about a million after twenty-five years of operation. Yet this program has met the traditional reactionary opposition of the American Medical Association. We shall continue to press for the extension of the social insurance program, especially for those groups in our society who stand in the greatest need of help against the loss of income. 37

Another part of the social insurance program which closely affects the welfare of individuals and families is unemployment insurance. Perhaps the most pressing need in the social security field is for a comprehensive overhauling and improvement of the unemployment insurance system. In the hands of reactionary state legislatures and in the absence of any effective standards governing the amounts and duration of benefit payments and qualifications provisions, unemployment compensation has completely failed to keep pace with present-day requirements. The improvements that

are most needed can be accomplished only through positive action on the part of the Federal Government.

As a further minimum step toward the reconstruction of the unemployment insurance system, a program of uniform national standards governing benefit amounts, duration, and eligibility requirements must be adopted so as to remove from the shoulders of jobless workers the burden of cutthroat interstate competition which serves to hold benefits down to an inexcusably low level.

20 A major area of human need that has not been touched by our social insurance programs is health. If the objective of social welfare is to promote the well-being of individuals and families, then a program of national health insurance should have first priority. Adequate health services must now be considered one of the necessities of life along with food, clothing, and shelter. Illness currently represents a major threat to family security.

The cost of medical care is only a part of the problem. What about the quality of medical and hospital care? What about preventive health programs which would obviate both the cost and the suffering of illness? If we intend to meet fully the entire problem of adequate medical protection, it will require a many-sided program of aid to medical education, including the training of nurses and technicians, a more extensive hospital and health center construction program, improvement in the quality of care through encouragement of group practice, and, of course, a comprehensive health service plan based on the proven principles of the Federal social insurance program.

33 While organized labor has emphasized the development of rounded social insurance programs, we have also favored improvements in public assistance legislation. Our public assistance programs in many states do not provide adequate support to the aged, to dependent children, or to other groups covered by them. We shall continue to urge Congress to include a program of general assistance covered by Federal matching grants. We shall continue to oppose residence requirements for public assistance.

These are not the only programs affecting the welfare of broad segments of our population which concern the AFL-CIO. Some of the major programs favored by the AFL-CIO, include housing



and slum-clearance, prevention and control of juvenile delinquency, expansion of maternal and child care, expansion of services to our aging population, rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, and mental health.

The problems which will confront social work in the years ahead are already in the making. What many refer to as the "second industrial revolution" is already upon us. A new technology is being developed which is bringing closer the realization in America of man's age-old dream of economic abundance. We are blessed with the resources and with the means to turn them into products for men to use and enjoy. Improperly used, our technology can create a social and economic nightmare in which men will walk idle and hungry. The organized labor movement will make every effort to arouse the conscience of government, of industry, and of the American community so that the fruits of our modern technology can be widely distributed among the people. Along with higher living standards, our increased productive potential can bring us greater leisure, as well as greatly expanded social welfare programs, to say nothing of the vast cultural opportunities which can be opened up. I hope that social work will be prepared to take full advantage of the opportunity to serve the people in a creative and imaginative way. In the final analysis, I am convinced that the only measure of the greatness of any civilization is not its material wealth; it is the measure of moral and social responsibility it demonstrates in turning material wealth into human values.

In the South we are witnessing an important struggle in the never ending fight for freedom. The repercussions of the Supreme Court decision on school integration are being felt in every phase of human endeavor in that unhappy part of our land, and social work is no exception. Racists are trying to erect barriers between people where none existed before. In many communities all over the South, Negroes and whites had learned to work together for the common good. Now the hatchet men are seeking to destroy the advances made in race relations in the South in all spheres of human activity, including social work.

You, as leaders in your profession, will, I am sure, continue to

carry out your obligation of service to people. You will, I am sure, continue to use your skills to help people understand their community needs and help them to work together as citizens without regard to race or color. You will, I am sure, stand up against the efforts of the "know-nothings" to cripple the financial status of those recognized voluntary agencies that render service to minority groups. You will, I am sure, stand up against all attempts at segregation within your own profession. None of these things will be easy, but you will not be alone.

Today literally thousands of trade union members are deeply involved in social work agencies and their programs. We serve on national, state, and local agency boards and advisory committees; on boards of innumerable health, welfare, and recreational agencies, both public and voluntary. Our members give vast sums in aggregate to the support of voluntary agencies, mostly through community chests and united funds. Union support is given freely to secure the passage of social legislation at all levels of government. A staggering number of man-hours are given without question by union members to committees making studies or surveys of all kinds of community health and welfare problems. Many union members have been elevated to positions of leadership as expression of the recognition and thanks of their communities.

The voluntary participation of citizens from all walks of life in the affairs of the community lies at the core of the democratic process. It broadens and deepens a person's respect for his neighbors, it creates a common denominator for cooperative action, and it provides the training ground for the leadership of our democratic society.

Let me assure you that labor's interest in social welfare is as broad as social welfare itself. I have mentioned only some of the programs which seem to be most important to the long-range development of social welfare in America. I did not mention the constructive impact of negotiated health and welfare programs on the social welfare structure in our communities. I did not mention our interest in, and concern for, the thousands of physically handicapped who could be useful, productive citizens if the means of rehabilitation were available. Nor have I said anything about

our concern and activity on behalf of the chronically ill—and these are but a few of the many social welfare activities in which organized labor participates.

Let me remind you that the relationship between organized labor and social work in a real sense has just begun. There is a long agenda of unfinished business ahead of us. Together we can create a society free from economic want and free from intolerance, a society which encourages the fullest development of the individual and permits the fullest expression of the individual's capabilities, a society firmly rooted in the concept of an ever expanding democracy and dedicated to the cause of peace.

cat - 51  
54

## *Religion and Social Casework*

by *FELIX P. BIESTEK*, S.J.

THE RAPID GROWTH of casework theory and practice during the past thirty years is partly attributable to the liberal borrowing from psychiatry, psychology, medicine, law, and sociology. Much of our terminology, much of our knowledge of normal and pathological human behavior, and many of our values have come from these older disciplines.

Strangely, however, social work has adamantly shunned religion as a source of knowledge and values. Our profession seems to have a phobia of entering into any kind of positive relationship with religion. This remains one of the most controversial subjects in our profession.

We have successfully avoided the controversy during the last two decades; our professional literature and conferences have kept an almost complete silence on the subject, giving the unfortunate impression that religion holds no interest for the social worker in his professional life, neither as an element in his philosophical framework nor as a possible resource in helping people.

The objections to the liaison of religion and social work are easily identified:

1. Social work is social work; religion is religion. The two are incompatible, and the mixture is dangerous.
2. The introduction of religious values into the conceptual framework of social work would endanger the hard-won and fully validated social work principles and practices; it would make impossible the principle of client self-determination and the non-judgmental attitude. Moral standards would be imposed upon clients; they would be judged "worthy" or "unworthy."
3. The desire to link social work and religion in any way is

a symptom of some unresolved, unconscious, and unprofessional personal need of the social worker.

4. The doctrinal conflicts existing between the various faiths would compound the professional conflicts already existing in social work.

These objections are instrumental in producing the impression that it is quite unprofessional even to discuss the subject publicly. This attitude has caused the profession as a whole to deny its ancestry in the manner of a sophomoric juvenile who is ashamed of his unsophisticated but warmhearted foreign-born parents. We need to remind ourselves that the real ancestor of modern social work is the religiously motivated social welfare of the Judaeo-Christian eras rather than the inhuman Elizabethan Poor Laws.

The purpose of this paper is to point out the areas of casework theory and practice which could be enriched by religion: the philosophy of life; the theory of personality upon which casework is based; the standard of values and the resources used in helping people; and the operating principles of social work practice.

The assumption in this discussion is that we believe in God who is the Supreme Being, the Creator and Lord of the universe.

The term "religion" is not easy to define. Theologically, it is that form of the virtue of justice which urges us to render to God, both privately as individuals and publicly as social beings, the worship and reverence we owe him. The elements of religion are a creed, a moral code, and the practices of worship. "Religion" here refers to those concepts, principles, and values which logically flow from the basic creed of all Christians and Jews. I think that these basic beliefs are expressed in the following propositions:

1. God exists. He is one. He is a person. He is the Creator of all things. Infinite love is the reason for all His actions. He created with a plan and a purpose.
2. Every human being has a spiritual, immortal soul.
3. The final destiny of all human beings is eternal happiness in a future life.
4. The attainment of that destiny, the acquisition of that happiness, depends upon the person's moral life upon earth, upon his living according to the laws of God.

In speaking of the use of religion in social work, we also include cooperative efforts with clergymen as referrals and resources.

A philosophy of life is a plan of life. It arranges and integrates into a meaningful pattern the intricate and sometimes perplexing details of human living. It provides a systematic knowledge of the origin, nature, ideal function, and ultimate goal of human life. It supplies a system of values; it indicates the things which are worth living, fighting, and dying for; it spells out the meaning of human success and failure. It indicates the answers to some of the most puzzling questions of human living.

52 The need for such a frame of reference has frequently been emphasized by the leaders in social work.<sup>1</sup> In 1952, one of the workshops at the annual meeting of the American Association of Schools of Social Work underlined the same thing. The purpose of the workshop was to list areas of knowledge, attitudes, and skills which every social worker should have. The participants agreed that the very first requisite for all social workers should be a philosophy of life.<sup>2</sup>

Where, if not to religion, should social work go for such wisdom? Without reference to God, human life is unexplainable and deprived of all meaning. Would not our help be truer and more effective if we had an awareness of the final destination of the road of life as intended by the Author of life?

42 The goal of social work, we claim, is to help individuals and groups make a better adjustment to their environment. However, we are very vague when we try to explain what we mean by "better adjustment." "Better" is the comparative of "good." What is good? What is a good life? What is the relationship between life and death? What happens after death? What is man? Just a biological organism, or something much, much more?

Answers to these questions can come from religion only. And they ought to be in our philosophy, since we deal with important issues of life. This does not mean that we preach to people in

<sup>1</sup> Milford Conference, *Social Case Work, Generic and Specific* (New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1929), p. 28; Katherine Lenroot, "Fundamental Human Needs Facing the Social Worker Today," *The Family*, XVI (1935), 102.

<sup>2</sup> *Toward an Integrated Program of Professional Education for Social Work* (New York: American Association of Schools of Social Work, 1952), p. 5.

the casework interviews; it does not mean that we impose our philosophy upon people; it does not mean that the social worker assumes the role of a clergyman, a catechist, or a teacher of religion. But it does mean that the social worker will have a sense of direction while helping people who have lost their sense of direction.

The theory of personality focuses upon individuality. The content of a theory of personality can be divided into five areas: first, it identifies the totality of influences upon human life, including the inner needs and drives and the outer influences of the total environment; second, it selects one of these influences as the principal one, which is considered the most important because it is the integrating force of personality; third, it indicates a general pattern of normality in the interaction of these influences; fourth, it identifies the principal causes of pathology; and fifth, it indicates the principles and methods of treatment. A theory of personality is explicit or implicit in every "school" of psychiatry, psychology, and social work. 36

The theory of personality, obviously, is greatly colored by the philosophy of life. If the psychiatrist or psychologist sees the human person as principally a biological organism with some social controls, his identification of the inner and outer influences upon the individual will be strongly weighted toward the physical. And some aspect of the physical will be selected as the principal force in the formation of personality.

In social casework, at the present time, the theories of personality of Sigmund Freud and of Otto Rank are dominant. Neither of these includes man's religious needs or his relationship to God among the totality of influences. There is a complete disregard of the importance of religion in human life.

Social work has not kept up with the recent developments in psychiatry concerning the importance of religion in personality growth and maturity. Carl Jung was the first of Freud's original disciples to make this discovery in clinical practice. He wrote:

During the past thirty years, people from all civilized countries of the earth have consulted me. I have treated many hundreds of patients, the larger number being Protestants, a small number of Jews and not



more than five or six Catholics. Among all my patients in the second half of life, that is to say, over thirty-five, there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook.<sup>3</sup>

Since the time of Jung, many psychiatrists, of various schools, have become convinced through their clinical experience of the reality and of the importance of religion as a vital element in mental health and in personality maturity; hardly a meeting or a convention of psychiatry passes without a discussion of this topic. Clinical institutes have sprung up in many parts of the United States, dedicated to the examination and development of a more complete relation between psychiatry and religion.

In social work, however, we still cling to the horse-and-buggy days of psychiatry when religion was considered a defense mechanism, a sublimation of an id drive, used to escape reality in an unrealistic way. Our naïvete is pitiful.

In its simplest terms, a system of values provides answers to these basic questions: Is this good? If so, how important is it? We champion adequate medical care and exert our efforts toward promotion of health standards and services. We promote economic security for all people.

27 We have closely allied ourselves as a profession to the promotion of mental health. We recognize the psychological component of religious problems in the lives of our clients and we direct our skills to the relief of neurotic guilt feelings. But, as a profession, we manifest a condescending neutrality about the ontological reality of moral and spiritual evil. The word "sin" disturbs us, not because of sin's evil and destructive effects, but because some people consider it an outdated concept creeping up from its medieval grave in an unsportsmanlike way. We do not recognize the difference between real guilt, which results from the violation of God's law, and neurotic guilt feelings. We seem to have such an exaggerated fear that some caseworker will impose moral stand-

<sup>3</sup> Carl G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (New York: Harcourt, 1936), p. 264.

ards upon clients that we exclude moral standards from our value system. We need very much to reconcile religious values with our principles of acceptance, self-determination, and the nonjudgmental attitude.

This condescending neutrality causes us to neglect almost completely an entire area of resources in helping people. Insight into religious concepts such as God's Providence, for example, can be a real resource in casework, and in some cases the only effective one. What resources does a medical caseworker have in helping a terminal cancer patient? Do we have any resource to help a client adjust to the fact of imminent death? Or, consider the parents who have just received the final report that their child is mentally defective. Helping them with their feelings is only a partial aid. Parents do not adjust to this hard fact until they develop insight into a religious concept.

Or, take the breakdown of family life. What can we, as social workers, do to strengthen family life and thus help prevent a host of social problems? Religion is a vital factor in happy homes. Love of God holds the family steadfast. Religion promotes stability in marriage; it contributes to the growth of love, of character, of self-sacrifice, of self-discipline. Religion provides an inner reinforcement, a clearer vision of duty, a fresh faith, and a renewed courage to face problems. A home built on religious concepts is a fortress against delinquency. Children need a home built upon religion; they need religious values woven into the fabric of their lives. In religious homes, children learn the necessary virtues of honor, decency, respect, and love of God, of country, and of their parents.

The biggest obstacle, in my opinion, to incorporating religion and religious values into social work's philosophy of life, theory of personality, standards of values, and resources is the suspicion that religion is incompatible with the operating principles of acceptance, self-determination, and the nonjudgmental attitude. There is an urgent need for a clarification of these principles:

1. *Acceptance*.—"Acceptance" has been confused with "approval." It is a technical term, differing in meaning from the word as it is used in common parlance. The caseworker, obviously, does

not approve of the sex delinquency of the unmarried mother, or of the parolee's negative attitudes to law and law enforcement officers. The object of acceptance is not "the good" but "the real." Acceptance is a principle of action wherein the caseworker perceives and deals with the client as he really is, including his strengths and weaknesses, his positive and negative feelings, his constructive and destructive attitudes and behavior, maintaining all the while a sense of the client's innate dignity and personal worth. The purpose of acceptance is to aid the caseworker in understanding the client, and to help the client free himself from undesirable defenses so that he can deal with his problem and himself in a more realistic way. The caseworker accepts the unmarried mother's ambivalence about sexual behavior, because her ambivalence about moral standards is real and is pertinent to her problem. He accepts the parolee's negative attitudes, because they are a part of the problem and need to be aired out, clarified, and straightened out.

22  
2. *Client self-determination.*—The principle of client self-determination is the practical recognition of the right and need of clients to freedom in making their own choices and decisions in the casework process. Caseworkers have a corresponding duty to respect that right, recognize that need, stimulate and help to activate that potential for self-direction. The principle of client self-determination can become a meaningless cliché, however, if the client's right is not balanced realistically with limitations to that right. Freedom is not synonymous with license. Human freedom is a means, not a goal in itself; it is a means for attaining the legitimate proximate and ultimate goals in life. It cannot, therefore, sanction self-injury or injury to others.

Four limitations to client self-determination are generally recognized by caseworkers: the client's capacity for positive and constructive decision-making; agency policy and function; civil law; and moral law.

The limitations to human freedom arising from the moral law are especially pertinent to our discussion. The natural right to make choices and decisions about one's life does not extend to moral evil; a person may have the physical power for such a choice,

but he has no real right to make it. Ordinarily, the choices confronting the client are within the framework of moral good, but cases do arise in which the client is inclined to a course of action which is objectively immoral. A caseworker cannot then assume an air of indifference but must help the client to avoid such a decision. The realistic worker knows that a morally out-of-bounds decision may be a source of future problems, perhaps worse than the one which is being avoided by illicit means. Such situations may raise perplexing questions, especially when the caseworker and the client are of different religions.

Many of the commonly accepted moral laws, such as those prohibiting stealing and murder, are covered by the civil law. In some cases, such as divorce, sterilization, and abortion, the civil law may legislate some restrictions while the Church contributes others. Some moral laws are a part of the Church's legislation only.

The caseworker, especially when he is of a different religion, must respect the conscience of the client and help him make choices and decisions which are within the boundaries of that conscience. Violations of the moral law and acts contrary to his conscience not only can produce psychological difficulties for the client, such as guilt feelings, but also do spiritual damage. The caseworker needs to have a real conviction about the ontological reality of moral and spiritual values. The caseworker is not promoting the total welfare of the client if he helps the client to solve a social or emotional problem by means which are contrary to the client's religious faith.

3. *The nonjudgmental attitude.*—To confuse the nonjudgmental attitude with indifference to social, legal, and moral standards would be tragic. This distinction is important; the caseworker refrains from judging the guilt or innocence of the client; but the caseworker objectively evaluates the attitudes, standards, and actions of the client. The client feels hurt when *he* is judged; he is not necessarily hurt if his *behavior* is evaluated.<sup>4</sup> The caseworker's motive and purpose in evaluating behavior are clear: to understand rather than to judge the client. The case-

<sup>4</sup> Felix P. Biestek, S.J., "The Non-judgmental Attitude," *Social Casework*, XXXIV (1953), 237.

worker has an interest in the deviation from standards and values, but not for the purpose of assigning blame. He is interested in the causes of the client's behavior only in so far as this understanding is an aid in furthering the client's present and future adjustment. For a sound diagnostic evaluation, he needs to know the client's ego strengths and weaknesses, and his conflicts toward a healthy adjustment to reality.

Standards and values, being a part of reality, are not only compatible with the nonjudgmental attitude, but are indispensable for effective casework help. Three reasons confirm this conviction: First, the caseworker, because he is a social worker, has a social responsibility; he is a representative of the community, whether employed in a public or a private agency. He is necessarily allied with social, legal, and moral good. His function is to help the individual within the law and within the basic values of a society founded upon a belief in God. Second, the client will not be helped if he finds that the caseworker is indifferent to the anti-social, illegal, or immoral attitudes or standards that brought trouble to the client. Third, to maintain the integrity of his own personality, the caseworker cannot remain interiorly indifferent to standards contrary to his own. If, for example, a client is engaged in behavior which the caseworker considers contrary to the natural law binding all people, the caseworker cannot be expected to change his own philosophy. He must remain true to himself. However, this does not necessarily mean that he will be moralistic, or that he will impose his own personal code of ethics upon the client. He knows that every person has a right to follow his own conscience. In some instances, however, where subjectivity of interpretation would result in antisocial or illegal behavior, the limitations to client self-determination would be recognized and discussed in the casework way.

Does the caseworker ever need to discuss his evaluation of the client's unacceptable behavior or standards? It depends on the functioning of the personality, especially in the area of the super-ego. If the client's acceptance of healthy standards of behavior is unimpaired, even though conflict exists, the evaluation may not need to be verbalized, because the client usually is able to make

such appraisals himself in the security of a good relationship. If, however, the client has begun to reject objectively healthy standards of behavior, in his effort to ease the tensions in his life, this may need to be discussed in a therapeutic way. When based on adequate diagnosis and a strong relationship, comments and interpretations about deviant and self-defeating behavior are appropriate and often necessary techniques.

Inherent in these three operating principles, to conclude, is the recognition of values, including moral and religious values. Greater clarification of the full meaning of the principles is evidently needed, but there is no conflict between them and religion, whether in the caseworker's philosophy of life, in his theory of personality, in his value system, or in his resources. If this is true, and if we accept religion as a vivifying force in human life, do we have the courage to look into it for the further enrichment of the social work profession?

42  
3  
27  
37  
22  
35  
36  
32

## *Our Challenge in Social Welfare*

by MARION B. FOLSOM

IN ITS VERY EARLY HISTORY, social work operated within a narrow area—measured by today's standards. Social work activities then, of necessity, were directed primarily toward alleviation of want—directed more toward effect and less toward cause and cure. While social workers were thinking in terms of cause, and themselves had a broader horizon, a number of limitations dictated that their job in the early days was largely to relieve human misery as well and as quickly as possible.

42 Today's concept and practice of social work embrace not only the alleviation of want but efforts toward the elimination of its cause. In the application of this concept, human welfare is a matter of total social environment. This is so well demonstrated by the National Conference of Social Work, which has grown and changed to keep abreast of social change. The Conference now has representation from a wide diversity of activities and interests which reflect virtually all the factors that bear on human welfare.

Under this broad concept, social welfare in America is the work of many organizations, both private and public. Regardless of where social welfare is practiced, however, it has a common bond—a common dedication to the worth of the individual and his right to dignity and equal opportunity to fulfill his aspirations, in so far as possible. This is the common cause of all who work in social welfare.

In the total scheme which contributes to social welfare in America, the Federal Government, obviously, plays an important role. Like the National Conference, the Government's concept and practices which contribute to social welfare have undergone major revisions over the years.



The Government's activities should be guided, I believe, by two broad principles. First, the various levels of government should serve as a mechanism through which the people act collectively in social welfare matters when the individual or collective private effort cannot act effectively. Second, the Government's social welfare activities should be designed, not to foster dependence, but to encourage individual self-reliance, initiative, and creative enterprise.

Fundamental in the Government's relation to social welfare is the fostering of a healthy economic climate, in which expanding productivity yields a larger volume of goods and services for all. For a broadly shared prosperity, with rising levels of living, can provide the opportunity for a more secure and satisfying life for more and more people and thus reduce the number of persons in distress.

Certainly, one recent mark of the changing concept of the Government's role in social welfare was the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the first new executive department in forty years. The everyday, human problems of people in health, education, and economic security were placed in the highest council of government—in the President's Cabinet—for the first time. The many activities of this new department have a common denominator; they relate, in one way or another, to the personal well-being of every man, woman, and child in America. For health, education, and economic security are fundamentals in the total environment which contributes to human welfare.

Today, the Administration is earnestly seeking to strengthen, to expand, and to improve many of the Federal activities through which individuals may attain improved health, better education, and more economic security. And so we are proposing a 24-percent increase in the department's appropriations for the coming fiscal year, including \$450 million in new legislation.

This is the second largest increase ever sought in these activities in any one year. We are seeking this expansion because we know these programs build a firm foundation for the future. They advance the welfare of the individual human being. As the individual advances in health, education, and economic security, not

only is his own life enlarged, but the nation as a whole is enriched. For progress in these fields is fundamental to progress in our expanding economy, our national security, our system of self-government, our very way of life.

In strengthening these programs, the aim is to bring to them a new emphasis, a forward look. We recognize that simply spending more money is far from the answer. We are seeking to emphasize the more constructive aspects of these programs—those activities which are most particularly concerned with the future. The proposed expansion involves new or improved research in every field in the department. We want to explore some of the hard-core problems that have beset health, education, and welfare for many years. We want to head off other problems before they become acute. Our proposals are based on the simple principle that to relieve human distress is good, but to prevent it is much better.

One of the best hopes for improving the level of health lies in constantly advancing medical research. Largely through progress in medical research, within the past ten years the death rate has dropped more than 50 percent for pneumonia and influenza and about 73 percent for tuberculosis. The threat of paralytic polio is being lifted from millions of children. And yet, disease and disability still exact a terrible toll. Cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, for example, still present enigmas to medical science.

Federal funds for medical research already have been increased greatly, but they are still too low in relation to the need or the dramatic opportunities for the future. The Administration, therefore, has asked Congress for the largest increase in funds for medical research ever recommended in one year. The proposal called for appropriations of \$126.5 million, an increase of \$27.5 million, for the National Institutes of Health, the principal research arm of the Public Health Service. A major portion of these additional funds would be used to increase by 47 percent the Government's grants for research conducted by medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and scientists throughout the country.

Clearly, medical research cannot be expanded and improved without adequate laboratories and trained men. And yet today there is a critical shortage of modern buildings and equipment for medical research and training. We have proposed, therefore, a

new, emergency program of Federal grants to medical schools and other nonprofit research institutions for the construction of modern research and teaching facilities. Under this program, over a five-year period, \$250 million would be provided in grants, to be matched by the institutions. The program not only would provide more and better facilities for research but would help train more scientists and physicians to fill a critical need. 46

The Administration's program in the field of health includes many other steps. Proposals are now pending before Congress:

1. To expand and improve the training of practical nurses, professional nurses, and public health personnel
2. To establish a continuing national survey to develop sorely needed basic information on the nature and extent of sickness and disability in the population 20
3. To strengthen the effort to control the pollution of streams and rivers
4. To provide grants to finance special demonstration projects to develop improved methods of caring for the mentally ill
5. To encourage the expansion and improvement of voluntary health insurance to help meet the rising costs of medical care

We are hoping for early Congressional action on these and other proposals which are designed to improve the nation's health.

In the effort to foster social welfare in its broad aspects, in our emphasis on constructive action for the future, the education of children is also of crucial importance. For a weakness in education severely limits both individual advancement and national progress.

One out of every four Americans today—almost 40 million—is a full-time student in school or college. The country has spent some \$30 billion in the physical plant for their education, and we spend about \$14 billion each year to operate our educational system, from kindergarten to college. And yet, in view of the fundamental importance of education, in view of the tremendous scope of the educational system, it is a shocking fact that the Federal Government has been investing annually less than half of \$1 million in research to help make our educational system more efficient and more effective.

And so, in 1956, President Eisenhower has urged upon Congress a major increase from about \$3 million to about \$6 million in

(17) funds for operating the Office of Education. This program would expand many services now provided by the Office to schools all over the country, but the bulk of the funds would be employed to provide a comprehensive and far-reaching program of cooperative educational research for the first time in our history. The goal is to illuminate some of the problems that have been retarding the progress of education.

(18) One of the problems we hope to study is waste of the nation's young talent. Every year about sixty thousand of our best students drop out of high school. And of those who do graduate, half of the students in the upper fourth of their class do not go on to college. We need more study and more facts on the critical problems of housing and staffing our schools and colleges. We hope to explore how best we can meet the educational needs of families with low incomes. We want to study how our schools, having direct daily contact with children, can help prevent juvenile delinquency; how we can help the retarded child to learn more; and how we can help the child with exceptional mental ability to make the most of it.

Proper physical facilities are equally important if education is to make its maximum contribution to social welfare. Today, well over half a million children across the country are attending half-day school sessions because of the critical shortage of classrooms in their communities. Several million other children are preparing for tomorrow's complex world under the handicap of schools that are too old, too shabby, or too cramped.

President Eisenhower for many months has been urging enactment of a sound and effective emergency program of Federal assistance to help needy communities build more classrooms for our children. Under the Administration's proposal, Federal assistance would be designed to encourage even greater school building efforts by states and communities. It would be distributed where the needs are greatest and financial resources are weakest. And it would carry no vestige of Federal interference with instruction.

Despite the great need, Congress so far has taken little action toward enactment of this proposal. We are earnestly hoping there

will be no further delay in helping provide more schools—for the welfare of children now and for the future welfare of the country.

In the meantime, forethought is being applied to another aspect of education. Within ten years, enrollment in the nation's colleges and universities is expected to increase 50 percent. A group of distinguished citizens recently appointed by the President is currently studying future needs and a broad range of other problems in higher education. While higher education is the responsibility of the states, localities, and private groups and institutions, comprehensive planning on a nationwide basis is needed.

In the wide range of the department's activities, one of the most striking examples of constructive action in the prevention and elimination of human need is the Federal-state program of vocational rehabilitation. A few years ago, the number of disabled persons restored to productive employment was declining. The President proposed and Congress unanimously adopted a major expansion and improvement in rehabilitation services, providing more funds, more facilities, more research, more training of personnel. Now there is a steady increase in the number of persons who are conquering the handicap of disability and finding new hope and dignity in a productive life. We are planning still further expansion and improvement in this program which brings such rich humanitarian and economic rewards for today and for the future.

The value of forethought and planning in the prevention of human distress is increasingly evident in the steady growth and maturing of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) program. One of the landmarks of OASI is the 1954 law increasing benefits for everyone covered by the system and making protection available to an additional 10 million workers. Today, nine out of ten American workers can look forward to social security benefits in their retirement. Should death take the family breadwinner, nine out of ten families are protected with survivors' benefits.

The system is in excellent condition. It is one of the corner-

stones of the national effort in social welfare. It is significant that OASI provides the only source of independent income for perhaps 70 percent of the persons now receiving retirement benefits. If it were not for this system, several million additional persons might be forced to turn to public assistance to meet their essential human needs.

In our progress in health, education, and economic security, we as a people have come a long way. Today, this country has achieved an unprecedented prosperity, more broadly distributed among the population than ever before. But we still have a long way to go in improving the total environment which contributes to human welfare. In our complex and changing society, there are inevitable dislocations and handicaps which leave some persons behind the general advance. In the midst of national plenty, almost 5 million persons depend on federally aided public assistance programs for some or all of their basic needs. In the light of the problems and troubles which this denotes, the most constructive concepts and practices must be applied to the public assistance programs.

The Federal-state public assistance programs were established in days of economic catastrophe. In the depression, many millions of families were left with little or no income, and many communities had inadequate resources to help those in trouble. In this climate, the emphasis naturally and properly was placed on providing cash income to meet immediate needs. Through the intervening years, however, we have not been able to apply sufficiently and widely enough the broader concept of social welfare to the public assistance programs. The challenge and opportunity today is to provide more than cash payments to many of those on public assistance. For those who can benefit, we should provide the services which will help them overcome the causes of dependency. Many social workers, both in public and in private welfare programs, have demonstrated the value of this broader service.

It is true that many of those receiving public assistance are aged or disabled to the point where they have little hope of supporting themselves or their families. For these, we can make life more comfortable and rewarding through services to help them toward



more self-care. On the other hand, many of those receiving public assistance, although crushed by adversity for the time being, are capable of future independence. For these, the best service we can provide is to help them build toward independence and a rich and full life.

A crippling disease takes a wage earner off the job, perhaps permanently. A person needs costly hospital care and has no way of paying for it. Blindness strikes, and the sightless person must rebuild his life. These are obvious reasons for public dependency, and so we have well-established programs to prevent or alleviate need due to these reasons.

A less obvious but no less disturbing reason for people to be in need of public assistance is the breakdown of the family unit. Today, 43 percent of all recipients of public assistance are in the Aid to Dependent Children program. More than half these people are dependent because of divorce, separation, unwed parenthood, or the desertion of the father. These family problems require the expenditure of more than \$300 million a year of Federal, state, and local funds, to say nothing of the expenditures made by private organizations and individuals.

We are realistic in our programs to safeguard the public health. In most American communities we have skilled professional workers with access to good medical facilities. We need comparable resources and similar approaches to prevent family breakdown and the resulting social problems for individuals and communities.

Any family in trouble can present the gamut of human problems. The most recognizable and most urgent need may be for financial assistance, but financial assistance is by no means the only help that is needed. The public welfare agency serving these families needs to be able to appraise their total situation. It needs to be equipped to uncover the problems that brought about the need for financial assistance and to help the family take constructive action concerning them.

Studies made in different parts of the country have indicated that many economically dependent families are among the so-called "multiproblem" families—families whose troubles are com-



pounded of disease and social maladjustment as well as poverty. Such families constitute a very small proportion of the population. But they absorb most of the time, service, and money spent by both public and private welfare services. And they are passing their way of life with its problems and its misery to succeeding generations.

3 It is obvious that we should concentrate on breaking this tragic cycle. This requires intensified welfare services and the use of professional social work techniques, as already demonstrated in child welfare and other programs. But family rehabilitation of this type calls for many more trained social workers as caseworkers and supervisors and for greater community support of their work. Only 23 percent of the workers in public assistance agencies have had any graduate-level training, and the schools of social work are currently turning out fewer than 2,000 graduates a year.

The Administration is gravely concerned about the shortage of trained social workers. We are asking Congress to increase substantially the Federal share of funds granted to the states for the training of welfare workers. We know that qualified professional workers are essential if welfare programs are to solve complex human problems.

Family rehabilitation on a large scale will also require more knowledge of the basic causes of dependency. Estimates indicate that expenditures for all research and development projects in this country amount to about \$5 billion a year. Of this amount, it is estimated that less than one tenth of one percent, or \$5 million, is spent for research relating to problems of social welfare. And yet, the nationwide cost of public assistance alone amounts to almost \$2.75 billion a year. As we know, the cost in human terms is far more important.

11 We are asking Congress for funds to conduct a nationwide research program aimed directly and specifically at public dependency. We propose to analyze existing knowledge on the causes of dependency and examine the methods of reducing dependency. We want to see demonstrations and experimental projects undertaken in selected counties in each of the states in an effort to

rehabilitate many of the people now forced to live a life of public dependency.

One of the serious problems of persons on public assistance is the cost of medical care. Many states have been unable to meet this problem effectively. We are proposing a revision of the law which would make available a greater share of Federal funds and encourage better medical care for these aged, sick, and handicapped people.

We are also proposing a more equitable sharing arrangement between the states and the Federal Government in the cost of public assistance for those who are receiving benefits from OASI but who also need supplemental income.

In all our efforts in public assistance we agree, I am sure, that the most humane and constructive thing we can do is to help those on public assistance get along without it, if this is possible. As we work to salvage and strengthen the qualities of individual self-reliance, we are helping people to a sense of their worth and dignity and to a more satisfactory life.

However welfare activities may be classified, by population or by program, all of them are important in human terms. But if we mean what we say—that we must accent prevention and apply vision for a better future—then we must certainly renew our emphasis on children. For herein, literally, lies the future.

We are all painfully aware of the increasing number of children who are brought to juvenile courts because of alleged delinquent behavior. For more than a year, the President has been urging legislative action to authorize grants to strengthen and improve state and local programs to control and reduce juvenile delinquency.

Recognizing the important role of basic welfare services in helping neglected and dependent children, as well as those in danger of becoming delinquent, we have also recommended an increase in Federal grants for basic child welfare services. Under this program, Federal funds for local child welfare services are limited by law largely to rural areas. When the program was getting under way in 1935, this limitation assured that services

would be provided in the area of greatest need at that time. But in the past twenty years, conditions have changed, and what was then a strength of the program now hinders its well-rounded development. There has been a major shift in population from rural areas, and almost 60 percent of the nation's children now live in urban communities. If child welfare services are to reach children, they must follow children to the places where they live. We have asked Congress to amend the law so that child welfare funds may be used wherever they are needed.

We hope that Congress will act promptly on all these proposals for the benefit of children.

These proposals in health, education, and welfare reflect the emphasis so badly needed now and for the future in these Federal activities. These proposals are aimed, not only at improvement of existing programs to meet changing needs, but at the longer-range objective of striking at root causes.

No one could wish more fervently than the members of the National Conference of Social Work that welfare problems did not exist. For you are the people who are confronted daily by human distress and who work under this intimate compulsion to eradicate it. But you are also aware, more acutely than most people, that we live in an imperfect world, the product of the interplay of imperfect conditions and an imperfect people. And, hence, the social welfare job will never be done.

33 But experience should have provided us the wisdom, and our accumulated knowledge and facilities have given us the means, to look ahead and plan—to apply measures for prevention and cure on a broader scale. We have in the widespread application of this concept the hope of vastly improving human welfare.

29 The National Conference of Social Work, representing broad and diverse social welfare activities, has a long and illustrious history of contributing to the improvement of human welfare. The day-to-day work of its members, its programs, have helped weave the social fabric of an increasingly improved American life. Social work has helped strengthen in America the voice of compassion, of duty, of social justice, of vision. This voice should never be stilled.

# *Medical Care in Public Assistance Programs*

by *FRANZ GOLDMANN, M.D.*

ORGANIZED MEDICAL CARE, in the wide sense of the term, has come to be recognized as essential to the effective and economical operation of the public assistance system as well as to the welfare of needy persons. There is hardly a more fascinating chapter in the history of social organization of medical care in this country than the story of the progress from repression of pauperism to rehabilitation of the recipient of public aid; from provision of some medical treatment and minimal custodial care to that of a wide range of protective, curative, and rehabilitative health services; and from reluctant acceptance of paupers to eligibility of all persons receiving basic income maintenance and, increasingly, of medically needy people.<sup>1</sup>

At present more than 5 million recipients of public assistance and a considerable number of people with marginal income are given medical care, widely varying in type, quantity, and quality, at a cost to the taxpayer of several hundred million dollars a year.

The programs in advanced communities are designed to assure good personal health service early, in an adequate amount, and over a sufficient period of time. They extend through the stages of health or apparent health, acute sickness, convalescence from acute sickness, and prolonged illness. They provide for the services of physicians, dentists, visiting nurses, medical social workers, and other professional and auxiliary personnel; for diagnostic laboratory tests and prescribed drugs and appliances; for hos-

<sup>1</sup> Franz Goldmann, *Public Medical Care* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), pp. 69-150.

pitalization and custodial care in a medical institution; and for transportation to a clinic as well as ambulance service. They include service at the home of the patient, in the office or clinic, at the general or special hospital, and in the institution for long-term care.

Such broad programs exist only in about a dozen states and a number of our larger cities, but many communities throughout the country are considering plans for better provisions. Apparently, the old tactics of doing too little too late are about to be abandoned in favor of an aggressive strategy attacking dependency at its source.

The wisdom of maintaining public programs for those who cannot pay for needed personal health service out of their own resources or cannot obtain it from voluntary agencies has not been questioned since the death of the theory that "people must not be encouraged to be ill by the knowledge that they could be treated free at the expense of the State." But the growth of organized medical care as an integral part of public assistance in a number of states has created intricate problems of organization, financial support, and administration. It has revived the age-old controversy between those who think of the taxpayer first and are frightened by the threat of galloping costs and those who are primarily interested in the fate of human beings and decry the creeping gradualism followed in many parts of the country. These facts alone, not to mention other considerations, are compelling reasons for a searching inquiry into the subject matter in all its ramifications. The following presentation is intentionally limited to a brief review of the concepts guiding advanced communities in the development of good personal health service for needy persons and to a definition of the major issues confronting public assistance agencies in such an endeavor.

The prerequisites for the establishment and operation of an effective medical care program for needy persons are four: (1) statutes expressing the best thinking of the times as to objective, eligibility, direct services, and administration; (2) a service organization designed to attain high quality of medical care; (3) funds sufficient for support of the program and, especially, for

adequate compensation of those rendering service; and (4) an administrative organization assuring high standards, efficiency, and economy of service and respecting the dignity of the individual and the family. What, then, are the principles of action adopted in recent times?

*Statutes.*—Modern public assistance laws should designate medical care as a right, allow for liberal determination of eligibility when medical care is necessary, and set policies and procedures for organization and administration of all essential personal health services, with emphasis on full utilization of community resources meeting certain standards. 41

Inclusion of medical care in the list of fundamental human rights has become feasible with the accumulation of a vast store of scientific knowledge and technical skills, and it has become a reality in some states. Adoption of this principle by society carries with it a twin obligation: to develop adequate programs of public medical care for the needy and to establish suitable working relationships among the public agencies concerned, the voluntary agencies which in the past have been primarily responsible for meeting the economic and health needs of poor people, and the members of the health professions in private practice who have traditionally given of their time and money to help those who cannot pay for their services.

Extension of eligibility to the medically needy in a growing number of communities marks a new phase of public policy. It stems from the recognition that persons who can support themselves but do not possess liquid assets sufficient to pay the full costs of necessary medical care may lose their economic independence unless preventive action is taken. However, limitation of funds and considerations of general policy make it unavoidable to draw the line somewhere and, admittedly, in an arbitrary way. In actual practice, relatively few of the self-supporting people in the lowest income bracket are accepted for medical care, and then primarily for hospital care, nursing home care, or specialist service.

Provision of a wide range of personal health services for those who are maintained at public expense signifies realization of the



37 financial as well as the human value of a constructive approach. As ample experience shows, organized medical care can make an imposing contribution to the restoration of the sick or handicapped recipients of public aid to self-support, or, at least, can increase the functional capacity of seriously disabled persons, make them useful to themselves, or prevent their rustification. By removing disability as a source of prolonged dependency, organized medical care reduces the expenditure of tax funds for continued and probably indefinite support of large numbers of disabled persons. By improving the condition of those who cannot be made fit for gainful work, it releases relatives of the disabled for employment, frees resources in the community for other tasks, and decreases the expenditures of public agencies for continuous medical care involving high costs.

43 Up to now, only the minority of the states have passed public assistance laws, or special laws, incorporating the principles stated before, and many states have been content with dusting off and patching up their venerable poor laws. But the interest in better statutes is strong and may well lead to the long overdue revision of the pertinent sections of the Social Security Act as well as to the general adoption of state laws reflecting modern concepts of medical care. Those who believe that provision of good personal health service for the needy is incumbent on society as a whole can find valuable guides for future action in statements by leading national associations<sup>2</sup> as well as in detailed reports on the present place of medical care in public assistance.<sup>3</sup>

*Organization of service.*—Successful operation of a medical care program for needy persons requires establishment and constant improvement of a service organization that assures availability of competent professional personnel and good physical facilities in

<sup>2</sup> American Public Health Association and American Public Welfare Association, Joint Committee on Medical Care, *Tax-supported Medical Care for the Needy* (Chicago: the Associations, 1952).

<sup>3</sup> American Medical Association, *A Report on Medical Care for the Indigent in Eighteen Selected Communities, 1952-1955* (Chicago: Association, 1955); American Public Welfare Association, *Role of the State Public Assistance Agency in Medical Care*, a series of eight reports (Chicago: Association, 1953-1955); Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Public Assistance, *Medical Care in Public Assistance, 1946*, a series of twenty state reports, Public Assistance Report No. 16 (Washington, D.C., 1948).



sufficient number and reasonable geographical distribution, stimulates cooperation of all in meeting the requirements of the individual, and promotes high quality of medical care. To attain these objectives, public assistance agencies in an increasing number of states have come to emphasize: (1) widest possible utilization of acceptable community resources in personnel and facilities; (2) organized payment to professional personnel in private practice and to nongovernmental agencies, hospitals, and institutions for long-term care; and (3) conclusion of more or less formal agreements with nonprofit community agencies and associations representing the various health professions, the voluntary hospitals, and the private institutions for long-term care. However, in quite a few communities public assistance agencies rely primarily, if not exclusively, on governmental clinics, hospitals, and custodial institutions and on part-time or full-time district physicians, the counterpart of the parish doctors of colonial times.

Utilization of all existing resources meeting established standards is a highly commendable principle. In addition to further advantages it offers physicians, dentists, pharmacists, and members of other health professions in private practice, visiting nurse associations, voluntary hospitals, and private nursing homes in the community an opportunity to participate in the program on the basis of certain conditions; and it makes it possible for recipients of public aid to choose professional persons, and especially family physicians, from the list of participants in accordance with certain rules. Gratifying as the emphasis on freedom of choice is, actual experience with it reveals some unpleasant truths. If only a small proportion of all physicians practicing in the area of the program are willing to serve, thereby exercising their right to choose their patients, the recipients of public aid are drastically restricted in their right to choose their family physicians. If almost all physicians join the program but less than one third actually attend more than four fifths of the patients, the situation is perplexing enough to invite questions. And if most of the services at the physician's office, in the patient's home, and in the private nursing home are rendered by a small number of physicians known to possess less than average proficiency, while the highly skilled physi-

cians are available at clinics and hospitals only, concern over such a state of affairs is fully justified. It is easy to proclaim freedom of choice as an article of faith but it is extremely difficult to realize this noble ideal without impeding attainment of high quality of service, an equally valuable objective.

17 The present policy of systematically paying members of the health professions in private practice, voluntary hospitals, and private nursing homes for services to recipients of public aid strikingly contrasts with the former widespread practices of soliciting "the gratuitous services of the Medical Gentlemen," passing around slender emoluments, offering token payment to hospitals, and liberally honoring bills for coffins for paupers. It is based on the concept that the members of the health professions in private practice and the voluntary health agencies supported by philanthropy cannot and should not be expected to shoulder the burden alone. It expresses the conviction that fair payment to those rendering service is as essential to effective operation of general programs of medical care for the needy as it is to special programs for control of diseases of socioeconomic importance and of general health service programs for self-supporting people. However, there are drawbacks to the development of satisfactory arrangements for payment. It is anything but easy to obtain the necessary funds from the legislatures, to make a wise choice among the various methods of paying professional persons, and to determine what constitutes reasonable compensation for specific services. At present, the prevailing policy is to employ the fee-for-service method for paying professional persons and to use the visit as the basis for payment to clinics and the patient-day as the basis for payment to hospitals and nursing homes. The complex problems to be solved in deciding on the reasonable amount of compensation and the administrative implications of these methods cannot be discussed here. Suffice it to say that a complicated, cumbersome, and costly machinery must be maintained, with authorization and reauthorization of services and review and adjustment of bills as the most troublesome features. Yet, this price is not too high to pay for peaceful relations with the professional persons in private practice and with the voluntary health agencies.

Much good can be expected from the tendency to proceed from individual contracts with a few professional persons and some hospitals to collective agreements negotiated between the public agencies administering the medical care programs for the needy and the various professional associations involved. By creating a framework for the provision of specified services and defining the rights and responsibilities of the parties concerned, collective agreements help to give the recipients of public aid ready access to needed medical care, to protect the legitimate interests of the individual members of the professional associations, and to foster cooperation between those rendering service and the administrative agencies. They offer a unique opportunity to avert the danger of mass distribution of mediocre medical care and to raise the standards of service, as medical science advances.

*Organization of payment.*—It is simple to state that sufficient funds are a prerequisite for the successful operation of a truly useful program of medical care for the needy. But it is an intricate task to translate theory into a practical and workable plan of action. The difficulties are caused partly by the rising costs of health services but mainly by the particular health needs of the persons accepted for medical care at public expense.

Ordinarily, old people and children constitute the large majority of the recipients of public assistance, and they require much medical care because of health conditions peculiar to their age. The remainder includes many seriously disabled persons who often have been sick for years before applying for public aid. Compared with other socioeconomic groups, the recipients of public assistance must be hospitalized more frequently, be kept in the hospital longer, and be provided with medical and nursing service outside the hospital, with nursing home care, and with drugs and appliances more often and over longer periods of time. Accordingly, the cost of a broad program of medical care for the needy is relatively high, absorbing a substantial proportion of all expenditures for public assistance. It exceeds the financial capacity of most local units of government, and it is too heavy a burden for many states to carry without aid.

With the introduction of financial cooperation between Federal

(18) Government, states, and localities in operating special assistance programs the foundation has been laid for building a useful system of shared responsibility for the support of broad programs of medical care for the needy. If the principle of financial partnership between local, state, and Federal government is sound—and nothing better has been suggested—then it ought to be applied in the most expedient manner, be extended to all categories of public assistance, and be helpful in providing comprehensive medical care to those who depend on public aid. Up to now these conditions have not been met. Priority must be given to adoption of the principle of separate matching of expenditures for medical care, as any substantial payment for such service by a public assistance agency would exceed the limit set for Federal participation. In order to simplify administrative procedures the complicated formulas for Federal reimbursement of state expenditures—the delight of the statisticians and the despair of the administrators—must be replaced by a consolidated grant easy to administer and flexible enough to be used where the health needs are greatest. In order to help state and local agencies to perform their functions properly, Federal grants-in-aid must be provided for the medical care of the forgotten groups—the recipients of general assistance and the medically needy. This policy must be accompanied by appropriate revisions in the financial relationships between states and localities.

Understandable as the widespread fear of rising costs of medical care under public assistance programs is, it must not be permitted to becloud the real issue. At present, the total expenditures for public assistance constitute less than one percent of the gross national product—hardly a frightening proportion—and the medical care expenditures of public assistance agencies average 7.8 percent of their total expenditures, with a range from 0.1 percent to 29.5 percent. The latter figures must be interpreted with caution, as the practices in calculating and reporting medical care expenditures are far from uniform. Every effort must be made to avoid additions to the case load for long periods by furnishing essential services to the medically needy and to prevent prolonged support of dependent people by stressing those personal health services

which hold promise of making recipients of public assistance self-supporting or improving the functional ability of those whose dependency cannot be terminated. What is urgently needed is not merely funds to pay bills for professional, hospital, and institutional services, but a service organization guaranteeing the most productive use of the taxpayers' money.

*Administrative organization.*—The administrative organization of a medical care program for the needy must be conducive to attainment of early diagnosis, early, prompt and thorough treatment, high standards of service, and continuity and consistency of care. How to make this rule a living fact is still a much debated question despite marked progress toward its solution.

In building a suitable vertical organization, clear definition of the powers, duties, and functions of the public agencies at the three levels of government is of paramount importance. The most promising advance toward this goal in recent years is the system of state-local cooperation that has been developed in a number of states. State agencies formulate policies and set standards for the whole area, encourage local action, provide consultant service and financial assistance to local units, and, to a varying extent, supervise local programs. The localities are fully responsible for organization and direct administration of their own programs according to local needs and conditions and must carry a share of the cost. The guiding principle, centralization of policy-making and decentralization of direct administration with establishment of close relationships for technical as well as financial cooperation, merits serious consideration for wide application.

Sound horizontal organization of administration requires a single unit in charge of all personal health services, professional direction and supervision of all professional matters, and systematic cooperation of the governmental agencies responsible for personal health service with public and voluntary agencies engaged in health and welfare activities. At present, welfare departments are most frequently vested with authority to administer general programs of medical care for needy persons, while health departments usually are responsible for special programs for control of certain diseases. In order to discharge their functions ade-

quately, some welfare departments have established special units staffed with professional personnel and headed by physicians, and some utilize advisory committees, technical as well as general. But many departments have been reluctant to accept the principle of professional direction and supervision of medical care. Prejudice against the expert is not yet a thing of the past.

57 It is not surprising to find that the same sun still sets over the old issue: functional organization, implying unification of the administration of all personal health services, vs. separation of functions and segmentation of administration on the basis of the economic conditions of the groups served. Since the arguments for vesting health departments with responsibility for administration of general programs of medical care for the needy are as disputed as those in favor of welfare departments, the matter can as well be assigned to the lost-cause department. A promising way out of the dilemma is coordination of activities, with welfare departments determining eligibility and providing for income maintenance and related services and health departments having full authority for the organization and administration of the health services. This pattern has proved its value in some parts of the country and may well lend itself to introduction in communities possessing well-organized health departments. Where such a methodical interagency cooperation is not feasible the least that can be done is to stimulate interaction of the staff members of the various agencies concerned by systematic interchange of information on medical, socioeconomic, and behavioral aspects, consultation, and continuous interpretation of the various programs.<sup>4</sup>

Even the finest program of public medical care for the needy will produce unsatisfactory results unless its day-by-day operation is based on close cooperation with the governmental and non-governmental agencies providing for educational, social, economic, and vocational services and with all community agencies engaged in health activities.

Both official and voluntary agencies are manifestations of so-

<sup>4</sup> Jonas N. Muller and Pearl Bierman, "Cooperation between Health and Welfare Departments," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Public Health Association, November 17, 1955 (mimeographed).



ciety's sense of responsibility for helping those who cannot help themselves. They differ in form but not in objective. Neither can afford the luxury of splendid isolation. Cooperation between the two groups can be achieved only if both are willing to substitute the marital state for the martial state, to emphasize interdependence rather than independence, and to take joint responsibility for community-wide planning and coordination of personal health services for the needy so as to attain comprehensiveness, efficiency, and economy of good medical care.

*Prospects.*—Essentially, public assistance is a salvage operation set in motion when a person is in indisputable need, unable to obtain help from other public or private resources, and poor enough to qualify for acceptance. These facts must be kept in mind in discussing the future of organized medical care for people who cannot pay at all, or can pay only little, for necessary health services.

The frequency, extent, and duration of need for medical care through public assistance depend largely on three factors: the state of the economy in a given community or in the country as a whole; the degree of development of social insurance providing for basic income maintenance in contingencies beyond the control of the individual; and the degree of protection afforded by organized programs of medical care for self-supporting persons.

In periods of full employment, high wages, and stable prices, requests for public aid in general, and for public medical care in particular, tend to decline markedly. When job opportunities are lacking, wages are depressed, or inflation diminishes the buying power of the currency, the case load of public assistance agencies tends to rise sharply because of rapid influx of the unemployed who cannot maintain themselves and of persons whose earnings have become too low to permit any substantial expenditure for personal health services. Fortunately, the impact of adverse business conditions on the individual's standard of living and on the operation of public assistance programs can be cushioned by insurance.

Well-organized social insurance is a bulwark against economic need. It is the best means of relieving the relief system, although



it cannot end public assistance. If all working people are covered by social insurance against the economic risks of old age, temporary and permanent disability, and unemployment, and if the benefits paid by such programs, alone or in combination with complementary voluntary insurance, furnish proper protection, relatively few people will need public assistance for full support, including medical care. There will always be persons who require public aid for various reasons, such as age or limited earning ability, if not unemployability, due to a serious physical or mental handicap. Except during periods of severe business recession this group can be expected to constitute from 2 to 3 percent of the population of an industrialized country with a mature system of social insurance providing for basic income maintenance. But this group is certain to be larger in the absence of a medical care program effectively protecting self-supporting people against the costs of good personal health service with their potentially deleterious effect on the economic conditions of the individual, family, community, and nation.

Programs of medical care that cover most, if not all, of the self-supporting people and provide for comprehensive service in health and sickness reduce the need for medical care through public assistance to the irreducible minimum. Conversely, programs serving mainly people in the middle and higher income groups and offering limited benefits leave a wide gap that must be filled in the interest of society as well as of the individual.

In the search for ultimate answers to the problem of making comprehensive medical care of high quality available to all the people at reasonable cost, the relationship of voluntary medical care insurance to public medical care for the needy is of particular interest at present. If voluntary medical care insurance were developed as an instrument for provision of comprehensive service rather than as a device for financial assistance in case of serious illness, if it were accessible to persons with thin pay envelopes and meager bank accounts as well as to those possessing greater resources, and if it covered a large majority of the people, public medical care for the needy could be limited to a tiny proportion of the population. To believe in the probability of such a de-

velopment in the near future is to make easy assumptions. Up to now, influential groups have regarded voluntary medical care insurance as an arrangement for convenient payment of selected bills and have been opposed to the use of tax funds for subsidization of voluntary plans, a prerequisite for widest possible extension of enrollment and benefits.

Under these circumstances, expansion of public medical care is inevitable in order to help those who are not insured and cannot meet the full costs of essential personal health services. This means adoption of modern statutes governing medical care for the needy, larger appropriations of tax funds, creation of an effective service organization, and development of a suitable administrative organization. Then, and only then, will public assistance be equipped to build pillars of strength and towers of hope for those who cannot obtain necessary medical care through other sources. As John Stuart Mill remarked in his *Essay on Liberty*: "Energy and self-dependence are as likely to be impaired by the absence of help as by its excess."

## *A Ten-Year Plan for Improving Public Assistance*

by CORINNE H. WOLFE

THERE ARE STILL SOME 5.5 million people in the United States who are receiving public assistance, and in the foreseeable future we shall continue to have people in need of income maintenance and other social services.

Ten years is a short time in which to tool up to obtain social workers who possess the skill and the understanding necessary if we are to provide for individuals, for families, and for our communities, the services described by Helen Wright<sup>1</sup> and Nathan Cohen.<sup>2</sup> As members of the social work profession we must take a critical look at the present situation and consider what we wish our situation to be at the end of ten years. Do we believe that comprehensive public social services should be available throughout the country? If so, this must be the basic premise from which we develop programs for the future. The meeting of economic need and the provision of preventive social services will then take their appropriate places. Some persons dissociate the administration of public assistance from that of other social welfare programs. Possibly this is due to an overemphasis on the phrase "determination of eligibility" growing out of our concern to establish the objective base for administering the public assistance programs laid down in Federal and state law. The objective of the public

<sup>1</sup> Helen R. Wright, "Social Work Education and Social Responsibility," in *Education for Social Work*, 1954, Proceedings of Second Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1954), pp. 14-20.

<sup>2</sup> Nathan E. Cohen, "Professional Social Work Faces the Future," *Social Work Journal*, XXXVI (1955), 79-86.

assistance policies is to assure that the freedom and rights of individuals will not be hurt in the process of giving or withholding money. In our concern for the protection of the individual, we may have used the term "eligibility determination" in such a manner as to give the impression that the method of providing economic assistance is different from the casework method used in the other social services. Actually, the determination of eligibility is the process through which the client and the agency reach necessary decisions and work out the basis for their continued relationships.

As I reflect on the origin of social work, and the development of the social casework method, I wonder if as a profession we have almost gotten too far away from the people for whom the profession was originally intended. Have some of us tended to move casework from the depressing spheres of economic want and social delinquency to those more economically or socially advantaged? Is this in keeping with the generally accepted purpose of professional service to assist people individually or in groups to attain satisfying relationships and standards of life according to their capacities and ambitions and within the limits of communal obligation, and the accepted purpose of casework to help people achieve maximum self-realization compatible with the needs of others? These purposes have not been realized and still remain our goals. The problems faced by persons now receiving public assistance, by those who may receive public assistance in the future, and by those who may be in need of other social services, require that we seriously consider, first, how to provide services in the operation of our social agencies and, secondly, the relationship between that operation and the academic preparation necessary for the education of social workers.

To do this we shall need to ask: What are our objectives?

Are we concerned about the standard of living for all people in our society, that all may have productive and satisfying lives, or are we content merely to alleviate dependency?

Can we further develop ways in which our social welfare programs may provide a sound program of preventive services?

What is our responsibility for social action and community plan-

ning as our cultural and economic ways of life continue to change, particularly in this era of automation?

We must do something about the problems that we know exist in public assistance programs. We do not have adequate assistance in this country for all people. The average amount received, for example, by families in the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program proves that the level of living of many recipients is far below what experts define as adequate. This is illustrated by the average monthly ADC grant of \$24.31 in February, 1956, when grants ranged from a low of \$7.44 to a high of \$41.70. There are ADC recipients who do not have enough money to buy even the minimum essentials. Achieving adequate assistance must have priority in the next ten years.

Our social insurance programs should in the next decade assume basic income maintenance for many more people. Congress has again been considering inclusion of the disabled. If it were decided to make Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance available to the disabled, the number needing public assistance would thus be decreased. But, there will always be some, particularly persons in broken or incomplete homes, who do not fit into the insurance programs and who will still need some form of financial assistance.

Public assistance cases illustrate some of the most serious of our social problems, and typify those that may be found in any cross section of our population. We have cases that show the results of our changing social system and the impact of our economic development on society. We all know of needs that are not being met; of families and children inadequately cared for; of continuing dependency; of broken homes and waste in human lives. We all know the number of social work positions in this country, the number of trained, and of untrained, staff, the number of social work students, and the falling enrollment at a time when the demand for competent workers is increasing. We are familiar with the problems of large case loads; lack of supervisors; too much paper work; complicated eligibility requirements; lack of facilities for the care of neglected, destitute, and delinquent children, the senile aged, the chronically ill, the disabled; and in-

sufficient staff. Perhaps as we succeed in solving the problem of adequate income maintenance, other needs will emerge with more clarity, and we shall be able to understand the social realities of the society in which we live. Then we shall be able to direct our efforts to providing ways of making adjustments that will help make possible a satisfying way of life for everyone.

Social workers must concern themselves with ways of engaging more effectively in the prevention of major social problems such as family breakdown and juvenile delinquency. If an applicant is to be accepted for public assistance at present, we require that he be in need and old, or in need and ill, or in need and in a situation of definite family breakdown. Juvenile delinquency gained national attention only after it had become an almost insurmountable problem. The symptoms of potential breakdown could be identified in families, schools, and church associations, and if social services were available, perhaps the emergence of problems of such magnitude could be prevented. 41

Social workers, then, have considerable responsibility for seeing that social planning is furthered both in the public and in the voluntary areas, and that preventive social services are generally available to help people at the time of difficulty. However, this responsibility cannot and need not be carried by social workers alone. There are many citizens eager to participate in the development of public social services and in social planning. Many agencies, voluntary and public, have made extensive use of this reservoir of strength. We in public assistance have for several years been placing increased emphasis on strengthening this resource. Social workers must sharpen their skills in developing a community approach—the involvement of lay people, individually or in church, school, and other groups, in making preventive programs available. What, then, can agencies do and what can educators do to provide the leadership necessary to present within the next ten years a sound plan for public social services, including financial assistance, for all who may need them?

1. Can we come to an agreement as to the role of public welfare and the part that meeting economic need should play in our efforts to help persons achieve a more satisfying way of life? Is 53

public welfare to be only a palliative measure, or is it to be a means of assuring an adequate standard of living?

2. Have we really given sufficient thought to finding a method of providing public assistance in as understanding a manner as possible to those who must receive help from society? Despite all our efforts in the past twenty years, there is still considerable "feeling" attached to receiving assistance. Do we handle the means test, including the considerations now given to support by relatives, use of resources, budgeting, and so forth, in the best way? Should we give thought to other kinds of help, such as planning for the education and training of youth in assistance families and counseling in areas not directly related to the fundamental causes of economic need?

3. Do our laws, rules, and regulations with respect to assistance really provide a basis for giving service in the most constructive way? For example, in ADC how much longer can we afford to wait before making it possible, at the first indication of such a need, to give services designed to hold a family together? Will we wait until divorce, delinquency, and emotional illness become even more prevalent before we review our methods?

4. Will we continue to offer our services on the individual treatment level, or will our agencies make available in the future sufficient time and skill to implement a program of social action and community education which would help to prepare our children for successful family living?

If these improvements are to be accomplished, there must be concentrated effort to understand the problems with which we are faced and to tackle them boldly and broadly. Sound social research must provide the necessary basic information. It will take imagination to devise means of solving our problems, obtaining more facts, and grounding ourselves well in the knowledge, skills, and methods essential for working with individuals and groups. Fundamental to obtaining knowledge and skills is acceptance by the agencies of responsibility for participating in the development of social work education and for informing educational institutions on the unique aspects of the problems facing persons apply-



ing for help—thereby enabling the schools to plan their curricula on a practical basis.

The agencies need, with the help of the social work profession and of the educational institutions, to determine clearly and objectively the type and level of service that might be given by persons with varying degrees of education, and to determine whether certain kinds of work now carried by professional staff members could better be done by others. 46

In the administration of social service programs, there must be conscious creation of a climate that will enable staff to help people not only to maintain but to increase their capacity for handling their affairs, and to achieve a satisfying and happy life. Society, with the support of public agencies, must face the cost of giving this kind of service to people who need it now and providing it as a preventive measure to others in the future. Obtaining staff equipped with the knowledge and the skills needed will be a major undertaking—not a small task that can be undertaken by individual agencies—calling for a planned and directed program. During the next ten years we shall have to put a considerable amount of energy and money into the selection, recruitment, and training of staff if we are to have the necessary minimum core of interested and trained social workers.

In order to attain our goals in relation to training presently employed staff, preparing individuals for promotion to responsible leadership positions, and giving effective help to new staff members, agency planning should include provision for the following: 54

1. A clear plan for gradually raising the standards in qualifications for all positions. For example, the agency could start with a plan for raising the qualifications for basic supervisory and administrative positions. If an agency does not at the moment require that all supervisors have social work training, it might set the goal of requiring that at the end of a specified period, perhaps five to ten years, anyone promoted to a supervisory position must have completed his social work training.

2. The development of recruitment and staff selection methods that will enable agencies to obtain those persons best suited for social work—both as to intelligence and as to personality. This objective might be achieved by use of the team approach—the merit system, the agency

personnel director, the program director, and the staff development consultant all working together.

3. An adequate salary scale commensurate with the responsibility to be assumed in each position. The salary scale should also give recognition to educational achievement.

4. Educational leaves, work-study plans, and other devices to ensure that, within the time stipulated, staff would have the opportunity to meet the basic requirements set up by the administration. Working out such plans on a sound basis requires that the agency make an analysis of the present staff members as to age, education, length of service, and requirements for service under the law. This analysis should be made in the light of the possibility that the current program will be expanded, and that therefore long-range planning will be needed in order to raise the qualifications for each position.

5. Selection of the most mature staff members for assignment to agencies in rural areas where frequently one person is called upon to act as caseworker, group worker, community organizer, and administrator. The salary should be commensurate with the scope of responsibilities the worker must assume.

6. A planned program of staff development under the direction of a staff member who gives full time to this assignment. This program should include staff orientation, continuing supervision, refresher courses, and so forth. Attention should be given to the staff members who, because of age or other factors, will not be enrolling in schools of social work, or obtaining professional education on a credit basis. One way in which this could be done is through making a state-wide training plan, or even a plan for several states, in which short courses are conducted by agency staff members or faculty of colleges or schools of social work. Also, consultants in special areas of practice can be brought into the training program.<sup>3</sup>

14  
If Congress should pass the legislation now pending <sup>4</sup> to provide public welfare services and to make grants for the training of persons for employment in public assistance programs, this would help to assure a sound legal basis for Federal participation in the cost of services to public assistance families and furnish a strong impetus for obtaining skilled staff.

Those of us who are concerned about setting forth the guiding

<sup>3</sup> Corinne H. Wolfe, "Training Goals in Public Assistance," *Social Casework*, XXXVII (1956), 73.

<sup>4</sup> House bill 9091, Senate bill 3139, and amendments to Senate bill 7225, 84th Congress.

principles and the criteria for the education of social workers must determine what is a sound foundation for the teaching of social work and the knowledge and skills needed in its practice. Personally, I feel that a base for professional education should include broad basic knowledge in the following:

1. An understanding of the society in which we live and of the forces that determine our economic and cultural goals
2. Some knowledge of normal human growth and personality development, some knowledge of abnormal behavior, and, to some degree, of the reaction of people to stress and trouble
3. An understanding of one's own behavior in given situations
4. Some knowledge of the responsibilities inherent in happy family living and participation in community life
5. Ability to obtain facts and to make an objective analysis of them; ability to evaluate controversial situations and to reach decisions.

In brief, I should like us to develop our preprofessional education at the undergraduate level in such a way that those who are beginning either their employment or their professional education will be prepared to assume their role in our society as responsible, participating persons.

In public assistance programs, there is common acceptance of the fact that the knowledge and skills of casework constitute the basic method in dealing with the problems faced by persons in economic need. However, because of the very nature of the public assistance programs which deal with large numbers of persons, certain areas should receive particular attention in our professional graduate education. I question whether schools of social work are giving sufficient emphasis to the meaning of money in our society and to the impact that lack of money may have on the social and emotional capacities of people to deal with their personal problems in family and community living.

Providing for one's financial needs is of paramount importance to each of us. One wonders whether this urgency is peculiar to American society and, if so, what meaning this fact has for understanding and dealing with persons in financial straits. In public

assistance families, the impact of this need is felt to the fullest extent, and thus creates for both worker and client a problem that must be solved before either can profitably consider other problems.

37 While all social work training is geared to helping people who may be disadvantaged because of illness or disability, I question whether enough attention is being given to the needs of the individual who is facing, or has had, long-time disability due to physical, emotional, or social problems.

Public assistance more than any other social work setting points up the needs of the aged. Has sufficient attention been given to the development of curriculum content in human growth and behavior, and to the personality development resulting from the physical, social, and psychological impacts of aging? In this area, group work has made a greater contribution than casework. Should we not consider and develop more effective ways through which casework might be used in meeting some of the problems of the aged?

The need for social planning, particularly in small communities and rural areas, is increasingly important. Should not our professional schools place greater emphasis on this facet of social work, even though some of their students may be preparing primarily for casework or group work specialization?

Knowledge of, and skill in administration are primary essentials in the training of social work staff for the operation of public welfare programs. Are schools of social work relating to the field of administration those social work concepts that will further our goals for the improvement of our social agencies? Solution of the problems of administration, including supervision of a variety of staff giving a variety of services, will demand serious consideration.

Educational institutions, as molders of opinion have considerable influence on students. There is immediate need for our professional schools to face squarely the question of the status of social workers in public assistance programs. We must see that our professional services are used to accomplish our goals for society. As Nathan Cohen said, "Social work goals can be achieved only when

social welfare has become a major social policy concern of government on all levels,"<sup>5</sup> and, I would add, of all social workers.

If, then, professional social workers, agencies, and educational institutions are able to accomplish even half of these improvements, or to solve even a few of the problems that I have mentioned, we shall be able to look with pride, ten years hence, on the social resources we are able to offer. It will mean a concerted effort on the part of all of us to assure that the ideals expressed in our definition of social work will be implemented, and that the 1966 programs for social work under both public and voluntary auspices will have adequate funds and adequate staff to provide the basic social services needed by all our people.

<sup>5</sup> Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

## *Principles, Values, and Assumptions Underlying Adoption Practice*

by JOSEPH H. REID

42  
NO FIELD OF PRACTICE IN SOCIAL WORK is more before the public, more sensitive, or more controversial, than adoption. It is a subject that arouses strong prejudices, suspicions, and emotions. A United States Senate investigation of adoption has just taken place under the leadership of Senator Kefauver. Many county medical and bar associations and their counterparts on a national level have established committees on adoption or have taken stands pro or con. Columnists who rarely turn to social welfare for subject matter, such as Sokolsky, Pegler, and others, have written heatedly and at length concerning adoption. Practically every national magazine has within the last year carried one or more articles on this subject. Television and radio have found the subject of adoption to be of such mass appeal that in addition to many public service programs, several commercially sponsored programs have appeared, and at least two producers are considering commercially sponsored series on adoption. Where such great public interest does exist, the subject unquestionably touches upon basic interests and values of the American people.

51  
Much of the writing about adoption is hostile to adoption agencies. And I think it is fair to assume that such writing does reflect the common opinion of at least a large segment of the American public. Either the public disagrees with the assumptions, principles, and values that are held by social work in respect to adoption or else it does not understand them. I choose to believe that the latter is the case. It is not clear to the public what it is that social agencies stand for in their adoption practice and why they

believe that certain practices are more conducive to the welfare of the child and the community. For that matter, I think it is also true that social workers among themselves have often been confused about their values and practices and that only in recent years has a clear rationale developed that can be supported with conviction.

Adoption agencies are a creature of the public, not only because they are financially supported by the public. Society has established adoption services as one of the ways of discharging its responsibility for the protection and welfare of children whose own parents are unable to provide adequately for their care. The adoption agency and the social workers who carry out its services have therefore a pressing obligation to account to the community for their practices, and to clarify the values and principles on which these are based. The only way that adoption services can be strengthened and extended to every child who needs them is through public understanding and acceptance of the rationale that lies behind the practices of social agencies. Are the values on which we build professional practice unacceptable to the public? Are social workers completely out of line in their thinking? I do not think so. Although there is confusion, lack of clarity, and, as in any other developing scientific discipline, false starts and false premises, the basic things that the social work profession stands for, it seems to me, deserve and can get support from the body politic. Let us examine some of the assumptions on which the practices of adoption agencies are based.

1. The necessity for adoption agencies rests on the fact that adoption is not and should not be a private matter, with children being passed from hand to hand. It is generally recognized that there is an obligation of society to protect the child because he is incapable of protecting himself. Children whose parents are permanently unable to meet their responsibilities to them particularly require the protection of the state, as *parens patriae*.

2. Every adoption involves the rights, and at times conflicting interests, of three parties—the child, the natural parents, and the adoptive parents. These are protected both through legal measures and through the services of the social agency to which the state,



acting in its welfare function, has delegated the responsibility for the welfare of children.

Furthermore, out of social work knowledge and experience, and from that gained from other fields dealing with children, parents, and child-parent relationships, certain principles have evolved that are guides to practice that aims to carry out the purpose of adoption. Among these are: (1) There needs to be casework determination as to the needs of the child, the natural parents, and the adoptive parents before a sound adoptive placement can be made. (2) It is sound practice to place the infant in his adoptive home just as early as is possible, consistent with making sure that his own parents have come to a firm decision concerning his relinquishment. (3) There are certain essential qualities for parenthood, which potential adoptive parents should possess. (4) Finally, the agency has responsibilities to the child, to the natural parents, and to the adoptive parents. Everything that is done must be in the child's best interest, but certain protections are assured the natural and adoptive parents. The natural parents, for example, must be free from duress or pressure to make a decision. The adoptive parents must have an equal chance with others as they seek a child. All parties to the adoption must be protected in regard to confidentiality.

3. The primary responsibility of the adoption agency, as a social service provided by the community, is to assure the well-being of children. Services on behalf of the child necessarily include consideration of the needs of natural parents and adoptive applicants. It is not the purpose of the adoption agency, nor can it be expected to meet the needs of all those who seek children.

4. Placement of a child for adoption is a specialized service that requires the professional skills and understanding that have been developed in the field of social work. It involves also the utilization of knowledge and consultation from other professional fields available through the team approach of the child welfare agency, and the assumption of social responsibility for the welfare of the child, which is delegated to social agencies.

5. Every child needs and has the right to have his own parents. Therefore the first obligation of society is to make it possible for

him to grow up with his own people in his own home. No child should be unnecessarily deprived of his own parents.

6. The child's need for continuous, loving care and guidance is essential to his well-being and development and to the future of the nation, and must be provided for by others if the child's own parents are unable, or cannot be helped to give the care that is expected for children.

7. The purpose of adoption is to provide for each child who has been permanently deprived of a family of his own, and who can benefit by family life, a home in which he will have the opportunity for healthy personality development.

For many reasons these assumptions are not always clear and have not been sufficiently interpreted to the community which has created adoption services and to which the agencies administering them are accountable.

As social workers we also hold certain ideas of what is good for children. These represent our values, which may or may not be consistent with the values of others and often are, in fact, in conflict with them. For example, we value the capacity of adoptive parents for giving love and receiving love, for exercising parental responsibility, far above their wealth or their social status. We do not accept wealth or social status as an indication that a couple will be good adoptive parents. Therefore we attempt to free adoption agencies from all outside pressures. We believe that the only sound motivation for adopting a child is the desire to live a full life, to accept parental responsibility, to love and be loved. We reject as invalid motivations such as providing an heir for a childless family or attempting to strengthen a shaky marriage. Our focus is on the well-being of the child. Sometimes such a focus is in direct conflict with the values of religious groups who, though just as concerned with the well-being of the child, may place spiritual considerations far above temporal considerations. For example, many social workers reject completely the concept that if a home cannot be found for a child of his own religious faith, he should not be placed in a good home of another faith, even though it means that he will be deprived permanently of living in a family group as their own child.


There is, of course, a long list of other assumptions and principles and values that surround adoption practice. Some of them are just emerging clearly. Since social workers are part of a community, a culture, many of these principles and values are not based primarily upon scientific assumptions but have themselves grown out of historical accidents and the culture in which we live. In part, the existence of conflicting practices in social agencies and the existence of remnants of outmoded principles and practices can be accounted for as we look at the history of adoption and the culture out of which it has grown.

Perhaps the area that reflects the greatest confusion in the minds of adoption workers, and for that matter the general public, is the role of the agency in regard to the adoptive parents themselves. What are they? Are they clients? Are they people who are doing the child and the agency a favor by agreeing to adopt him? Or are they people for whom the agency is performing a valuable service? Before that question can be answered it is well to look at history. But a few short years have transpired from the period in which agencies did not have adoptive applicants rushing to adopt every normal white infant that became available. Just a few decades ago—twenty or thirty years ago; in other words, within the memory of not-so-old social workers who are still practicing—agencies had to go out and recruit adoptive parents for white infants. They had to try to “sell” the country on adoption. Attitudes toward illegitimacy, toward bringing children of different “blood” into the family, set up strong barriers to adoption. At such a time it was only natural that many social workers did consciously or unconsciously believe that the adoptive parents were doing the child and the agency a favor by adopting him. At that time I am sure agencies were child-centered, and believed that the purpose of adoption was to find a home for a child and not children for homes. But regardless of their professed convictions, I suspect that many had difficulty in resolving this principle with the shortage of adoptive applicants. Today we find this same attitude existing in respect to those who will adopt a so-called “hard-to-place” child. One only has to read the newspaper publicity given to a family who, for example, adopts several Eurasian

children or a blind child, or a family of two or three children. Cultural attitudes, as reflected in the newspaper write-ups, indicate clearly that the adoptive parents are regarded as performing an extremely valuable public service, they are to be praised and honored. And who would question for a moment that parents who will go to great expense to correct a serious physical defect in a child or knowingly struggle through several years of difficult adjustment with a seriously disturbed child are not worthy of praise and are not doing something for their fellow men?

When this situation existed, not only in respect to the handicapped child but to the normal white infant as well, it was only natural, perhaps, in the effort to "sell" adoption, that agencies developed the "blue-ribbon attitude" that still, unfortunately, exists in many quarters. Agencies held the conviction and attempted to convince the public that they could guarantee them a perfect child; that by coming to an agency the adoptive parents could be sure that the child was without physical, emotional, or mental defect; that his heredity was sound; and, in essence, that adopting a child was a far less risky procedure than having one normally. If adoptive parents were doing a child a favor it was only fair to guarantee them as good a child as could be found. Out of this attitude, or perhaps concurrent with it, developed a rationale, consisting of a series of rationalizations, that it was in the best interest of the child that he be a perfect one and match perfectly with a family. Agencies felt that if the child was imperfect, that if his physical defects or his emotional difficulties would make it difficult for him to be accepted by an adoptive family, he was in a sense unadoptable and it was better for his welfare that he be raised in a form of foster care other than adoption. Principles and values got all mixed up with convictions; but, to be fair, it is also true that other disciplines buttressed the attitudes of social agencies during this period. Noted psychologists, Gesell among others, assured the agencies that their tests did permit them to predict with accuracy what a child would be like in later years; in other words, guaranteed the adoptive parents a perfect child. Certain geneticists also led adoption agencies astray, and there is no question that for many years medicine, and particularly the

pediatrician, was very conservative in recommending the adoption of any child with a physical defect. But unfortunately this mixture of realities, a shortage of adoptive parents, prejudice in respect to illegitimacy, and invalid predictions on the basis of psychological testing, were not seen as transitory things. Rather, from them adoption agencies developed certain convictions which were held very strongly. Out of them came certain principles of practice relating to adoptability and unadoptability which we now reject. The fact of our rejection, however, will not for a long time allow agencies to escape public condemnation that takes form in a belief that agencies will, for example, not place cross-eyed children. It will be a long time before everyone in the general public is aware of the fact that agencies have changed their principles and convictions.

Broad cultural considerations have affected deeply the principles and convictions of agencies. It is trite to say that all of us live within our culture and we cannot divorce ourselves from it. But it is important to recognize that generally in the United States attitudes toward children have changed relatively rapidly in the last three or four decades. Children have a very unusual place in our culture as compared with others. It is not too far-fetched to say that we are comparable to certain primitive cultures in the South Seas in respect to the way in which we view children as being the *raison d'être* of our civilization. Paradoxically, as the child lost economic value, he gained social value. Children are no longer thought of as chattels to be passed by deed from one family to another. The parents' rights in regard to their children are sharply curtailed by public opinion and law, though some people believe they should be still further curtailed. A family in the United States is not considered complete or meaningful unless it has children. Childless couples have a multiplicity and diversity of pressures upon them to have children. Large families are becoming respectable. It can be fairly said that it is not socially acceptable not to have them. But on a deeper level, in a troubled and anxious world we have come to realize that of that which is good there are few things more basic than the pleasure of contributing to the development of another human being, to love

and be loved by a child. All religions of our Western civilization regard as the reason for the family the nurture of children.

The child, too, is actually a symbol of the fact that our cultural opportunities are not static. It is not only the immigrant who believes that in his children he will find fulfillment, that his child will have opportunities and therefore accomplishments far beyond those which he could have in his own life. Again it is not trite to say that in our culture children are the hope of the future (and at times an escape from the present).

These shifts in cultural attitudes and many others have of necessity contributed to a shift in the attitudes of agencies. Adoptive parents are not seen today as people who are doing a child a favor by adopting him. Rather, they are seen as people who are fulfilling themselves, enriching their own lives by the process of adoption. But because agencies see it in this way is no reason to believe that the average adoptive parent does so. Many of course do, but many, I am sure, approach adoption agencies with the thought that they are doing a generous and philanthropic act. Therefore, when they cannot get a child, or are rejected, their reaction is all the stronger. This fact is already reflected in the popular press. Articles headed, "Why You Can't Get a Child," or, "Why You Can Get a Child," have replaced, "Open Up Your Heart to a Child," or, "Have You Room for One More?"

And so principles have changed with these attitudes. Today most good agencies have dropped completely any guarantees of a perfect baby. The blue-ribbon concept is very definitely outmoded. But more importantly, agencies themselves have developed the conviction that they do not have a responsibility to guarantee a perfect child. Rather, they see, and the general public, I think, saw before them, that having children naturally or through adoption involves risk. There are no guarantees in life and there is no reason for adoption to be an exception. So we have articles on "Babies for the Brave" or we have agencies with confidence explaining precisely what can be ascertained through medical and other examinations and what cannot. We have agencies encouraging people to take risks—and not minor risks, but very serious ones. Through the help of geneticists, anthropologists, and others,



agencies can enable the parents to see precisely what the risk is. Of course, also influencing this fact is our present knowledge that known methods of psychological testing of infants have very little predictive value except in identifying gross pathology. Therefore, even if agencies wanted to guarantee blue-ribbon babies, they could not. This is not to say that it would not be desirable to be able to predict with some accuracy what the child's mental capacities will be in later life. Perhaps someday psychological tests will be devised that will be of greater use. But the important thing is that the fact that they do not exist does not for a moment cloud adoption as a process of helping children and families. In essence, we have recognized the strength, the courage, and the fiber of families in America to accept what comes and also really to be accepting of less than perfect children. In essence, we have recognized the power of love.

3 There are other parallel influences that have had an important effect upon the convictions and practices of agencies. A major one has been the research emanating from child development, psychiatry, and social work, that has so clearly established during the past twenty years the importance of early mothering to a child. John Bowlby's brilliant summarization of this research has had a deep influence upon agencies. As conviction developed of the paramount need to the child for an early and sustained mothering relationship, other considerations were placed in perspective. For example, were a psychological test developed tomorrow that could predict when the infant was eight months of age what his later development would be with 100 percent accuracy, I doubt that any good agency would use the test. The reason is that we realize how much more important is early mothering and therefore early placement. Out of this conviction the practices of agencies are changing very rapidly, and all progressive agencies in the country are doing their utmost to lower the average age of placement to its irreducible minimum. That "minimum" still has very different meanings, as has been revealed by recent studies. For some agencies it means an average of three weeks of age. For others, it is still unfortunately four months, but I think a time will come very soon in which, except under unusual circumstances, an agency



that has not managed to place its children well before they are three months of age will be considered guilty of poor practice.

Sometimes social workers hold a position that is essentially more conservative than that of a segment of the public. Some in our society, for example, would remove children from all unmarried parents at birth on the basis that they cannot provide proper nurture for them. I myself do not think that such a procedure would be consistent with American principles, law, and culture. In spite of this, however, I believe that it is very necessary that agencies do examine all values that exist in our culture and develop convictions of practice, points of view that take them into consideration. For example, the pendulum of social work attitudes in respect to the unmarried mother has swung rather wildly during the past few decades. There was a time when the attitudes of many of our churches and agencies were extremely punitive toward the unmarried mother. The scarlet letter of Hawthorne has still not disappeared from view. Perhaps reacting against this in the thirties and early forties there was a too permissive and nondirective attitude toward the unmarried mother. Agencies believed that they were guilty of prejudice if they did anything but let the mother make up her own mind concerning the disposition of her child. I believe, and I think this can be seen in most good agencies' practices, that it is necessary to have a point of view in respect to work with unmarried mothers. An agency has a responsibility of pointing out to the unmarried mother the extreme difficulty, if not the impossibility, if she remains unmarried, of raising her child successfully in our culture without damage to the child and to herself. Such a fact must affect our principles in working with the unmarried mother in respect to the disposition of her child. It is not an unwarranted interference with the unmarried mother to presume that in most cases it will be in the child's best interests for her to release her child for adoption. There still exists a great deal of fuzzy thinking around this subject. The concept that the unmarried mother and her child constitute a family is to me unsupportable. There is no family in any real sense of that word.

The concept, too, that the unmarried mother has an absolute

16 right for self-determination is to me fallacious, because there are many situations, in the case of a family or an unmarried mother, where the interests of the various members of the family so conflict that the agency does have to make a choice in the direction in which it is counseling the family in order to protect one member as against the other. In our set of values I think we have to accept the fact that when a child is involved and there is a conflict between the interests of the mother or father and the child, every effort should be made to resolve the situation in the child's favor. In work with the unmarried mother, her emotional needs, her motivations, her desires, cannot be given paramount consideration as against the needs of the child; in fact, in some situations, perhaps in many situations, the mother herself may suffer a loss for the sake of the child. Of course, we strive to help the mother see that her interests and the child's interests are indivisible, and in making her choice, she should proceed from this basis. However, an agency without a point of view in this regard flounders.

3 I think agencies have also reached conviction about the position of the adoptive parent. Certainly, adoption agencies have not been established primarily for the purpose of providing services to help the childless. Basically, they are child-centered agencies to find homes for children needing adoption. The adoptive applicant, to be sure, when he first comes to the agency, is coming for a service, and the agency has the obligation to interpret what service it is able to render for him and to differentiate it from giving or withholding a child. As long as adoptive parents feel that agencies exist for the purpose of giving or withholding a child and that essentially agencies will simply look the adoptive parents over and decide whether or not they should have a child, the agency is not making its point of view clear, nor will it ever have a chance of building decent public understanding. Rather than determining whether adoptive applicants will be good parents, the job of the agency is to attempt to help them determine whether adoption is a solution for the needs and desires that brought them to the agency, and whether they are able to meet the needs of children for whom the agency needs homes. Helping the applicants to decide and to become adoptive parents is a very real

service. The agency can also offer, within its knowledge and the limitations of that knowledge, the real services of selecting a child whose needs this family can meet.

The third service the agency can render, and one which no one else is in a position to render, is to make certain that the child is really relinquished, that the adoptive parents are protected against intervention by the natural parents. Here work with unmarried mothers or other natural parents is the key. Making sure that the child is relinquished is by no means just a legal matter. It is essentially a psychological one that requires the professional help of casework.

However, the agency must also have a real interest in the adoptive family's problem. For example, they should have expert knowledge concerning medical resources prepared to help the adoptive parent have children naturally. They should consider it their responsibility to assist the applicant get such help.

We could examine many other aspects of the assumptions, principles, and values in adoption practice and of cultural and historical considerations that affect them. One that merits discussion is the influence of law upon adoption, particularly our common law which developed during a period of English history in which the parent was granted more absolute rights than we are willing to concede today. Agencies must have conviction about their principles, and if it is law that needs changing, they have the responsibility to spearhead the movement to do so.

Our first responsibility is, of course, to clarify our own position. Fortunately, the evidence is clear that adoption agencies have regarded this as a priority task. Formation of the National Conference on Adoption, in which the practices of agencies were submitted to other disciplines, was an important step in this direction. Setting up the Adoption Standards Committee of the League, which has been meeting assiduously to enunciate standards and their rationale, clearly and unmistakably is another. Widespread efforts of agencies to sit down with the two other professions most intimately involved in adoption, law and medicine, in a fair and open exchange in examination of varying principles and values, is of deep importance. Citizens' committees, such as that in

California, are another major step in the right direction, and the frankness with which social agencies, such as the New York State Department of Social Welfare, have discussed in the popular press the problems that confront them in finding homes for children is extremely healthy.

When we seek to clarify our own principles, our own assumptions, it does not mean that we are seeking complete uniformity of practice, a solid front of procedure. Conformity is not desirable at this stage of human knowledge and should not be promoted as such. But to clarify values, to test them against the culture in which we live, is of major importance.

The fact that most of us believe that not only will children in a community be served best if all adoptions are completed through licensed adoption agencies but all applicants will have an equal chance makes it all the more incumbent upon us to make clear our convictions and our beliefs to the public. When we ask society to vest one of its most fundamental responsibilities in any one type of organization, we can only do so with a clear conscience if we have tested the way in which we propose to discharge that responsibility. No delusion is easier to come by than the delusion that one's own values and principles are held by others. It is not to be regretted that social workers in adoption agencies are made rather painfully aware that their convictions are accepted by only part of the public.

To get what we want for children, we must proceed with deep and determined convictions, and we must not be afraid to express those convictions clearly, even though they may conflict with those of others. We must have a point of view, and that point of view must be clear since we have accepted a professional responsibility that society has vested in us on behalf of children. We must also, then, accept the responsibility of advocating strongly to society how it must carry out its responsibilities if all children are to be served.

# *Social Group Work Theory and Practice*

by GERTRUDE WILSON

IN ORDER TO EXAMINE THE NATURE of the current theories and practices of a part of the profession of social work, it is necessary for us to view this part against the profession as a whole and the social-culture setting which affects it and which it affects.

Social group work, as one of the methods of the social work profession, was introduced during the first quarter of this century. It emerged at a time when there was a renewed dichotomy within the profession between social workers who primarily regarded the causes of social problems as those within people and others who located these causes primarily within the social situations in which people with problems were living. 32

This difference in point of view has found expression in the organization of various types of agencies, all of which may be classified as social welfare organizations although their methods of providing services differ. Some of these methods are used in the social work profession of today. The stimulus for the organization of services, and the development of methods to provide them, arises out of the lag between basic human needs and the ability of social institutions, particularly the family, religion, government, and economic systems, to meet them. In consideration of the changes of the last hundred years, it is observed that "industrialism" has had an increasing impact upon the total social culture of our time. We recognize the severe struggle experienced by individuals and groups to adjust to the sharp changes in the nature of their environment. The effect of industrialism is universal, it demands changes in the functions to be performed by all social institutions. The rate of 21

change demanded has proportionately increased with the rapidity with which technological advances have been applied to the production of material goods and to communication and transportation.

The impact of industrialism, and of the new insights into human behavior gained in the pre-atomic age, upon social welfare organizations and the profession of social work may be documented from history. While the time span is of insufficient length to identify significant trends in the effects upon the profession of the recent momentous discoveries relative to matter and man, it does indicate a direction for speculation.

Social forces affecting a large collection of people are, in the last analysis, recognized by their effect upon some people, as seen by other people, one at a time. People in trouble need help. Some observers will be stimulated to help themselves and/or other people meet their immediate problems. Others will try to eliminate the causes of the problems by a variety of methods. Some will be moved to work in both directions simultaneously. During the first twenty years of this century, while the agencies developing social casework services continued to devote the larger proportion of their time to working with people on an individual-by-individual basis, there was an increasing participation of other social workers in working "for and with the masses." The personnel of the social welfare organizations, both volunteer and staff, continued to reflect sharp differences of opinion between the people who identified with agencies devoted to changing the "social order" and those who identified with agencies which were developing "the art of bringing about better social adjustments in the social relationships of *individual* men, women or children." By 1915 the division was sharp, and the two approaches within the profession were evident in the literature of the first twenty-five years of this century.

Although Mary Richmond expressed the feeling that social caseworkers would welcome the results of the work of other members of the profession,<sup>1</sup> there is no indication that participation by social caseworkers in the processes of social change, other than

<sup>1</sup> Mary Richmond, *The Long View* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930), pp. 376-77.



on the individual-by-individual basis, was envisioned. Later, Miss Richmond added this dimension to the caseworker's function when she said: "I've spent the first twenty-five years of my professional life in an attempt to get social case work accepted as a valid process in Social Work. Now I shall spend the rest of my life trying to demonstrate to social case workers that there is more to social work than social case work."

The methods employed by the social reformers were largely limited to securing legislation aimed to prevent or control crisis situations endangering the life and happiness of segments of the population. Social problems became the "causes" of individuals or of a relatively small group who fought the battles of the underprivileged. There was only occasional emphasis upon helping groups to participate in changing social situations. It was primarily the care of the weak by the strong. This basic social philosophy dramatized by the social reformers was one then held in common by most of the personnel of the social welfare services, whether the approach to the solution of social problems was individual by individual or through reform programs.

As knowledge from the social sciences, psychology, and psychoanalysis became more general among social workers, the concepts, and consequently the principles and techniques used by social workers, were affected. Social concepts, which made possible the analysis of the social processes through which change takes place, brought the importance and significance of small and large groups into prominence. New knowledge about motivations of human behavior not only provided new insights to the problems which individuals experience as individuals, but make interpretation of interaction of individuals in groups much more meaningful. The First World War had sharpened the concern of most people for the values of democracy and the necessity for all of the people to take more responsibility for safeguarding them than just voting. The Gestalt of the concept of "the people" began to change from one of the individual and society (i.e., government) to a network of interlocking groups which constitute society. These were seen to be affecting one another in many diverse ways: some toward the growth of a more socially favorable social climate;



some toward an unfavorable one; some advancing the "good" for some groups at the expense of others. With knowledge of the labyrinth of groups through which social change gradually takes place came the recognition that people can be helped to participate in more rapid social change if they learn how to give direction to group activity aimed to achieve the desired result.

People critical of the social reformer's methods of "doing for" other people, but eager to participate in processes of social change which would eliminate the causes of some of the social problems, turned to the social and psychological scientist for basic knowledge. In such knowledge, guides were sought for further development of principles and techniques for social work practice. Through concerted attention to the significance of primary groups to society, grew, among other organized efforts, the progressive education movement within the educational profession and the idea of a specialization to serve groups within the profession of social work.

In the beginning, the people who participated in formulating and analyzing concepts, developing principles, and devising techniques for carrying them out, were identified with the professions of education, social work, and/or applied social and psychological sciences.<sup>2</sup> While professional education for group workers early found a niche in a school of social work, there was a great difference of opinion among those interested in developing methods of working with groups as to the professional identification of its practice. During the second quarter of this century, about half of the schools of social work introduced a curriculum for this specialization. It was not, however, until the establishment of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW)<sup>3</sup> that social group work came to be fully identified as a social work specialization within the social work profession as a whole. Although there have been many differences of opinion as to the professional identification and education of workers for the practice of group work, there has been little disagreement in the literature about its

<sup>2</sup> Identification of the contributors and their committee in Charles E. Hendry, ed., *Decade of Group Work* (New York: Association Press, 1948), reveals the wide range of fields from which the participants in the formative years of group work theory and practice were drawn.

<sup>3</sup> October 1, 1955.

basic assumptions: (1) that a sense of belonging is essential to the happiness of all human beings; (2) that certain life experiences and social situations interfere with, or deny to many individuals, the opportunity to have this sense of well-being; (3) that principles and techniques for helping people to develop a sense of belonging through participation in a group can be developed from concepts drawn from the social and biological sciences, and on the basis of our thinking about our experience in practice; (4) that these concepts, principles, and techniques can be learned by people who have the qualifications for helping others make the necessary social adjustments to participate creatively in groups; and (5) that the welfare of society is dependent on the constructive nature of the interacting processes of its many small groups. 52

The development of a conceptual framework from which principles and techniques of practice are identified, tested, and transmitted to other people is continuous and never ending. Concepts from political science, sociology, economics, anthropology, social psychology, and psychoanalysis are "tried for size" against live situations found in groups being served by imaginative, experimental workers seeking to improve their methods of working with groups. Principles and techniques have been and are being developed both deductively and inductively, and some are borrowed from progressive education teachers and caseworkers. Experimental recording of narrative records early was carried on in order to have some material more objective than memory against which to test the use of the concepts and better understand their meaning as operationalized in principles and techniques. 46

By the time the first course was organized in a school of social work, there was considerable material to be drawn from pioneer workers, especially those in the YMCA, YWCA, settlements, adult education, and in workers' education. It is, however, appropriately the work of faculty and students in schools where the largest contribution was made, and is continuing to be made, toward the development of organized and systematic curriculum content to build upon the basic assumptions of social group work. This, of course, is to be expected—the organization of conceptual material into systematic units is a major responsibility of a faculty of a

school; it is, unfortunately, just a "leisure-time" activity for most practitioners.

(19) The first group work students began writing narrative records describing their work with groups. Some agencies soon recognized the contribution of record-writing to the quality of the services provided to groups. These recordings<sup>4</sup> of students and workers have so far provided the most significant substantive material upon which current principles of practice are based. Within the last decade there has been increasing interest in testing the practices which have been established empirically through the techniques of experimental research. Some of the studies of small groups carried on by social psychologists and sociologists<sup>5</sup> have provided an experimental foundation for the principles and techniques used by the social group worker, but few such studies have been made by social group workers themselves.<sup>6</sup> These studies also provide new insights into the group process which provide stimulus for modifying old principles and techniques and developing new ones.

The development of a conceptual framework for work with groups within the social service field began as, and has continued to be, a group project to which educators, practitioners, supervisors, administrators, consultants, field representatives, and others have contributed. This is a project-in-process; it will never cease, nor will it be formulated as an absolute as long as new knowledge is developed in the behavioral sciences, and creative, imaginative, and experimental practitioners are engaged in helping individuals and groups to make the social adjustments necessary to function in our dynamic, changing society.

<sup>4</sup> Grace L. Coyle, *Studies in Group Behavior* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937); Clara Heckman, *The Group Records of Four Clubs* (School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, 1930); Ruth Perkins, *Magic Casements* (New York: Woman's Press, 1927), and *Program Making and Record Keeping* (New York: Woman's Press, 1931).

<sup>5</sup> See Bibliography in Paul Hare, Edgar F. Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales, *Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955).

<sup>6</sup> Juanita Luck, "A Study of Peer Relationships with Children in Their Latency Years" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1954); Helen Northen, "The Effectiveness of Social Group Work in the Development of Qualitative Participation" (Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1953); Etta H. Saloshin, "Development of an Instrument for the Analysis of the Social Group Work Method in Therapeutic Settings" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1954).

The responsibility of identifying or formulating and then operationalizing the concepts helpful to learning how to become an enabler in groups largely has been carried by people identified with programs of leisure-time, educational, and recreational activities. Both within the field and in the schools of social work, there has been only nominal interest in this area of practice on the part of the majority of social workers associated with other settings. As the group worker became knowledgeable of the significance of the concepts which brought increasing understanding of the social processes which occur in groups, he identified with these ideas and they became to him group work content rather than generic content for use of anyone who seeks to function more effectively as a member, leader, or enabler. The allocation to group work of the concepts relative to understanding the social processes in group life is illustrated by the fact that very few schools of social work offer this material as generic for all students, but instead require or offer one semester in group work to all students not specializing in it. Some courses in community organization include sociopsychological knowledge of groups in their content, but in most schools the course in group work must carry the full burden of providing this basic background for the practice of all social work.

Identification of group workers with the use of the social process in all types of groups is further illustrated in the report of the Committee on Function of the Social Group Workers of the A.A.O.W. issued in 1948:

Through his participation the group worker aims to affect the group process so that decisions come about as a result of knowledge and a sharing and integration of ideas, experiences and knowledge rather than as a result of domination from within or without the group. Through experience he aims to produce those relations with other groups and the wider community which contribute to responsible citizenship, mutual understandings between cultural, religious, economic or social groupings in the community and a participation in the constant improvement of our society toward democratic goals.

This statement does not identify or describe social group work as a specialization in social work; instead, it describes not only the goals of participation of any social worker in groups, but also of

any professional or lay person who may work with any type of group. To all of them, understanding many of the basic concepts and how to operationalize them is beneficial. It is important, however, to point out that the basic values of the social work profession—respect for human beings and the right of self-determination—are violated if enablers to groups are trained in use of techniques without understanding the principles and basic concepts from which they are drawn. Such training raises the floodgates for streams of “manipulation” rather than “enabling” people to participate in decision-making processes which safeguard their rights of self-determination.

In a single paper it is impossible to list, much less discuss, all the basic concepts upon which principles of effective work with groups are based. I have chosen ten concepts<sup>7</sup> related specifically to “groups,” each of which leads to other concepts, and all of which provide illuminating insights into the intricate processes of interpersonal relations which occur in groups of people. These concepts help us to see selectively and understand and communicate what goes on in the group process. To this extent, they help us to develop and refine principles and techniques. Some of the concepts from which principles of work with groups are drawn are:

1. A group is the interaction of a collection of human beings.
2. All groups are alike and all are different.
3. All groups have a purpose, not necessarily conscious, which is expressed in the substance of the interaction.
4. All groups originate either as “psyche” or “socio” groups; the first drawn together for purposes of personal satisfaction and the second, because of an external educational interest or common task.
5. All groups experience conflict and exercise controls—the equilibrium or homeostasis of the group.
6. All groups have two kinds of structure: (a) interpersonal relationships seen as the process of acceptance creates isolates, pairs, and triangles; and (b) division of labor through which roles are assigned to “get things done.”

<sup>7</sup> A “concept” may be defined as an abstract idea of universal significance.

32  
concepts

7. All groups use a decision-making process based on elimination, subjugation, compromise, integration, or combinations thereof.

8. All groups reflect the social status system of the community and create one of their own in its decision-making processes.

9. All groups develop morale or *esprit de corps* which distinguishes each from all others.

10. All groups tend to develop traditions.

These concepts are some of those which are essential to understanding any type of group; they provide a basis from which any person working with a group in any capacity may develop principles and techniques for working with them for any purpose, i.e., to control, manipulate, or enable them. When principles and techniques are developed from them for use by social workers, the value system of the social work profession has a determining influence on the formulation of principles and how the techniques for implementing them are used.

There are social work principles<sup>a</sup> based on these concepts. The enabler:

1. Respects all human beings and their social organizations through respecting their right to manage their own lives.

2. Accepts each individual and group as unique and the right of each to be different from every other.

3. Feels with individuals and groups without necessarily feeling like them.

4. Adjusts his behavior to his understanding of the behavior of the group.

5. Accepts and handles negative and positive feelings for the benefit of the group.

6. Diagnoses where the group is and helps it to move on from there.

7. Supplies the group with needed factual material and helps it to recognize issues without indicating solutions.

8. Stimulates the group to consider implications of issues and new horizons.

<sup>a</sup>A "principle" is the operationalization of a concept which translates the concept into action.



9. Supports the group in making and carrying out decisions consonant with individual and social welfare.

10. Recognizes the structure of interpersonal relations as an influential factor in group decisions.

11. Helps the group to divide responsibility and involve as many members as possible in planning and executing a program.

12. Respects and uses the structure established by the group for division of labor.

13. Expects conflict and helps the group to use it constructively.

14. Accepts the role of authority, when necessary, without passing judgment.

15. Understands the social status system of the community and neighborhood and helps individuals to live with it or to change it, when change is necessary to safeguard the right of self-determination and the welfare of the community.

In human relations there are usually many techniques<sup>9</sup> for applying a single principle. Techniques are chosen in light of the purpose of the group and the worker's understanding of the people and the social situation in which they are involved. They are not applied automatically in the practice of social work. The enabler:

1. Knows the name of each individual in a group and addresses him according to the accepted way in his culture (not always by first name or with title, but in the way which he expects).

2. Is able to discuss matters of interest to the members' daily life, not just the affairs of the group.

3. Considers the schedule established by his group as important as any other obligation.

4. Is the first one to arrive at the meeting, in order to observe who comes with whom, who sits with whom, who agrees with whom, in order to identify subgroups.

5. Gives sociometric tests.

6. Uses buzz sessions to secure more participation in activity.

7. Uses blackboard (or helps the group's leader to use it) as a method of helping groups keep on the subject in a discussion.

8. Uses visual aids.

<sup>9</sup> A "technique" is a specific way in which a principle is applied.



9. Arranges chairs in a circle.
10. Stimulates new interest by exhibits.
11. Uses role-playing.

This list of techniques could be extended *ad infinitum*, and each item has a meaning of its own.

Sociopsychological concepts, like all other concepts, are man's abstractions of his observations tested by the scientific method as to their universal significance without reference to the value system of the people, or of the social situation they describe. Their significance lies in the leads they provide to the applied scientists or practitioners for the formulating of principles of how to do something with people and groups. A member of a professional discipline which has a value system examines them to find how he can use their meaning in order better to serve the people whose problems lie within his professional competence.

Each of the selected principles listed above emanates from one or more of the quoted concepts, but each one carries meaning beyond the concepts themselves because each one reflects the value system of social work. As a social work principle, it is not enough to say that the worker, recognizing that a group is interaction, affects its processes. He does this with respect to the rights of the participating members as human beings for self-determination, and with respect for, and within, the limitations of purpose for which the group is organized. In other words, how he affects interaction comes from the value system of social work, but knowledge of the nature of interaction in any group, as learned from the social scientists, gives direction and concreteness to his activity.

The techniques listed, on the other hand, are not value-oriented, and unless they are used in relation to social work principles they will not provide social work service. The use of techniques without consciousness of their appropriateness to the particular group situation has as much potential for interference as for assistance to a group in the accomplishment of its objectives. There is no purpose served, for example, in a worker's using a variety of techniques to identify the subgroupings within a group unless he understands the meaning of the relationships they

signify: how they may advance or hinder the progress of the group; how to help them to maintain their identity and, at the same time, contribute to the progress of the group. Thus each technique represents the substance of what a worker does; the kind of help he gives a group, however, is dependent on his understanding of the principles which guide his choice of techniques.

Further examination and discussion of these concepts, principles, and techniques would reveal that these lists represent knowledge and skills needed by every social worker, no matter with what type of group he works. Social workers also need this knowledge and skill to work with the non-social work groups in the community which seek to lessen the maladjustments in social situations. Social change pressured by technology, mobility, threat of war, social cleavages, urbanization, and spatial communication present challenge to social workers who are daily in personal contact with the consequences of social change. The responsibility of working with community groups in changing the "situational field"<sup>10</sup> is one held by all social workers and is not primarily the responsibility of social group workers.

Observation of social work practice and of the curriculum content of most schools of social work seems to indicate that there is greater awareness of the responsibility of social workers to work in, and with, groups than evidence of the prerequisite knowledge and skill for fulfilling this responsibility. This is an appropriate time for an examination of the content of courses in group work, similar to the examination of the courses in casework which occurred about twenty years ago when these courses were carrying the major responsibility for teaching the understanding of individual human behavior. When this content was recognized as generic and developed in separate courses, the teachers of casework were freed to teach the social casework process per se. Recognition of knowledge and understanding of the basic concepts, principles, and techniques of working with groups as generic will likewise free the instructors in social group work to teach the distinctive characteristics of the social group work process.

<sup>10</sup> See Leonard S. Cotterell, Jr., "The Analysis of Situational Fields in Social Psychology," *American Sociological Review*, VII (1942), 370-82.

The distinction between social group work practice and work with groups is one which is needed, not just in relation to our professional organization and the curriculum content which supports the profession, but also in the fields in which we practice where we are in daily contact with workers who not only serve groups as part of social work practice, but who work from an orientation different from that of social work. Such distinctions are postponed for later consideration on the theory that we must first agree on what we do that is distinctive within our own profession before we can undertake the task of identifying similarities to, and differences from, other professional work with groups. A first step in this direction has been taken by the Group Work Section of the NASW through a questionnaire aimed to disclose evidence of agreement and disagreement around the meaning of social group work as shown in the opinions of the members and in the agencies' related policies and procedures as reported by them.

In contrast to the statement of the A.A.G.W. on the "Function of the Social Group Worker," many authors of books and articles present social group work as centered upon the growth or adjustment problems of the members of the groups served, with the assumption that group experiences which help members to grow and thus improve their social adjustment are contributions to the welfare of society.<sup>11</sup> The extent to which the definitions given by the six authors listed below are shared by the majority of practitioners is unknown.

The basis used in the NASW questionnaire to distinguish work with groups from social group work is that social group work "is a service to groups where the primary purpose is to help members improve their social adjustment and the secondary purpose is to

<sup>11</sup> For example: Grace Longwell Coyle, *Group Work with American Youth* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), pp. 26-31; Gisela Konopka, *Group Work in the Institution* (New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1954), p. 25; Alan E. Klein, "Recreation and the Welfare Dollar," *The Group*, XVII, No. 2 (1954), 3-18; Helen Phillips, "Achievement of Responsible Behavior through Group Work Process," University of Pennsylvania, p. 2; Harleigh Trecker, *Social Group Work* (New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1948), pp. 8-9; Grace Longwell Coyle, "Social Group Work," in *Social Work Year Book, 1954* (New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1954), pp. 480-81; Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, *Social Group Work Practice* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949).

help the group (whatever its structure) to achieve objectives approved by society."

One respondee comments:

I agree with the distinction established but believe that the definition is inadequate. I think the crucial distinction between social group work and work with groups has to do with (1) whether group members are perceived as having specific and identifiable social adjustment problems, and (2) whether the practitioner fulfills a role directed at the resolution of these difficulties through use of the group process.

19 Whatever the definitive statement of social group work practice may be, if it is to cover an area of professional practice it must designate the nature of the problems for which the service is designed, and describe specifically the principles and techniques applicable to helping people overcome them. Whether these problems are defined in terms of "social adjustment" or "growth" or some other terminology is of less significance than coming to grips with the fact that we work with people who have problems, and our services are aimed to help them to minimize or solve them.

In consideration of the agreement of the majority of the group workers who have returned the questionnaire that we should distinguish between social group work and work with groups, we propose the following assumptions which, if accepted by the majority of us, would help to clarify and define social group work practice:

1. Understanding the nature of group interaction (the group process) and the dynamics of human behavior is a prerequisite for anyone who successfully fulfills the role of an enabler for a group.
2. The role and responsibility of an enabler are determined by the primary purpose for which the group is organized.
3. When a group, such as a class, an agency staff group, an agency board, or a committee of a welfare council, is organized to accomplish a predetermined task, the primary responsibility of the enabler is to help the members to accomplish this task.
4. The enabler who works with a task-oriented group uses his understanding of the dynamics of human behavior and of the group with consideration of the adjustmental problems of the members, but he does not change the purpose or the content of

the group's program for the purpose of helping the members with their individual problems.

5. When a group is organized for the purpose of providing an opportunity for members to use the group experience for adjustmental purposes (personal growth and change), the first responsibility of the enabler is to diagnose (identify) the unique problems of each member in the group.

6. The enabler who works with a growth-oriented group carries the primary responsibility of affecting the interaction as expressed in the program content toward the resolution of the problems of the members. The program content is subject to change at any time in accordance with the problems of the members.

7. The adjustmental problems of members fall within the full continuum from common human problems to those caused by physical, social, emotional, and/or intellectual accidents, illness, or defects.

To summarize, we propose that the distinction between work with groups and social group work may be made on the basis of the following assumption: the distinction is to be found in the difference between the nature of the task-oriented group as compared to that of the growth-oriented group. In the former the group enabler's primary responsibility is to support the group to accomplish its task; in the latter, the enabler's primary responsibility is to help members use the group experience to resolve problems which are interfering with their personal growth and social adjustment.

Just as the principles and choice of techniques of working with any group are affected by the value system of social work, they are likewise affected by the more specific purpose of social group work service. Diagnosis is the core of practice. It is not sufficient to be well grounded in understanding the dynamics of human behavior. The social group worker serving a growth-oriented group understands as much as he can about the specific problems of each member in the group he is serving. This involves a study of each individual to secure as much understanding of the meaning of his manifest behavior as the combination of accessible facts of his life experience and theory can provide. The study is continuous, but the use of principles and techniques at a given time is determined

by the result of the study at that time. Knowledge and understanding of the problems of the members determine: (a) the techniques of using program content; (b) the direction of the interacting process between members and between individual members and the worker; and (c) the extent to which members can be helped to secure a feeling of belonging and acceptance of responsibility toward the group.

During the thirty years in which we have been endeavoring to establish a conceptual frame of reference for the practice of social group work, we have been hindered by the variety of usage of the words "group work." It has become a label for a catchall of functions rather than a term to designate professional service with definite, discrete meaning. It is currently used to describe: (1) a job classification; (2) a field of work; (3) a classification of agencies; (4) a philosophy or movement; in addition to (5) a method, which was the original intent of the words. Attempts have been made by some of us to keep the original use of the term by adding the word "social," and thereby indicate that social group work is a method used by social workers professionally educated to use it as a specialized social service in a variety of settings.

It is, of course, self-evident that no sound conceptual frame of reference can be developed to apply to an area of work which covers everything and anything which might be included in the job load of a worker or the variety of occupational skills and techniques needed by agencies to fulfill their purposes. If social group workers are to practice from a commonly accepted conceptual frame of reference, the first step must be the acceptance of the limitation of the term as one descriptive of a specialized method of serving people in groups. The term does not describe other group methods which social group workers use in such functions as administration and its various work with boards and committees; supervision, whether it be individual or group; public relations, or work with the variety of groups which are part of the community organization responsibilities which every social worker carries. These other functions are no less important, but they are not the practice of social group work; rather, they are the practice of social work, and they demand generic social work knowledge and skill which are essential to a social group worker



in the performance of his total job. Moreover, they are functions common to all agencies, hospitals, and institutions providing social services.

In the return to date to the questionnaire of the Group Work Section of the NASW, there is little opposition to the proposition that a distinction should be made between social group work and work with groups. Sixteen percent disagree with the distinction made in the accompanying instruction. Analysis of their comments indicates that the problem of semantics is the chief interferent in communication. The majority of respondees who disagree with the distinction made in the questionnaire offer substitute definitions which are synonymous with the idea in the original statement. It will take considerable reading and writing and discussion to settle the semantic problem. There are, however, a small number of respondees who regard "everything a social group worker does" as the practice of social group work.

Irving Miller has discussed a possible dichotomy between social goals and the process of becoming professionalized. He says:

Inherent in the nature of professionalism is the development of technical skills and technical knowledge, preferably unique and distinguishable from other technical knowledges and skills. . . . the demands and processes of professionalization seem at points to be in conflict with our social movement origins and tend toward conservatism and caution.<sup>12</sup>

It is important for us to recognize that all of social work has "social movement" origins. All social workers have an inheritance from the past and an obligation to the future to participate in the processes of social change which will "lessen the group tensions between the conflicting parts of society" and which will help to shape a society which purposefully aims to reduce the number of unhappy and maladjusted individuals in it.<sup>13</sup> To meet these obligations, we cannot side-step, avoid, postpone, or leave to others the necessary albeit painful intellectual task of the scholar, as well as of the practitioner, as we continue to develop the concepts, principles, and techniques of the social work profession and of the social group work specialization in it.

<sup>12</sup> Irving Miller, "A Critical Appraisal of Some Aspects of Social Group Work Theory and Practice," in *Group Work and Community Organization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), pp. 70-71.

<sup>13</sup> Coyle, *Group Work with American Youth*, p. 26.



## *What Is Community Organization Practice in Social Work?*

by VIOLET M. SIEDER

7  
2  
8  
AS THE ENORMITY OF SUCH MODERN-DAY PROBLEMS as juvenile delinquency, mental illness, growth of slums, and inter-racial tensions threatens to overwhelm many of our communities, there has been a growing awareness of the need for a reappraisal, not only of our existing social institutions, but, more vitally, of the social work methods and processes through which we attempt to help people to solve such problems. It is increasingly apparent that it is not sufficient to rely only upon the further perfection of the professional skills of casework for helping people on an individual or family basis, or of social group work for reaching them through organized small groups, important as these methods are. We have come to realize the significance of a dynamic relationship to the community for individuals, families, and groups—and that the need to have an active part in shaping social institutions and social policy and to feel necessary to community life is as essential to personal mental health as it is to the functioning of a democratic society. Through a growing body of experience in community organization practice, we begin to glimpse the potential for community reorganization and development when the interaction of individuals and groups is facilitated by the skills of a social work practitioner in community organization.

54  
We are evolving for community organization practice a working philosophy, principles, and methods. We shall attempt to show that community organization practice is identified with the generic concepts of social work, that it draws heavily on the processes of casework and social group work, but that it also de-

pend on specialized areas of knowledge and skill necessary for working with a community.

The various stages of the evolution of community organization objectives and goals have affected the development of methods and processes used by the community organization practitioner in social work:

1. First, we witnessed an effort to prevent client abuse of services offered by a multiplicity of independent voluntary agencies. This was reflected in the early settlement movement and more particularly in the community organization societies in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Methods developed to achieve this goal included the social service exchange, interagency agreements and referral procedures, and a beginning attention to standards, along with a concern for promoting social reform.

2. Secondly, we saw a need to avoid waste and duplication of money and effort in serving clients through an integration of services. This grew out of the Community Organization Society movement and characterized the early Jewish federations and chests and councils of 1909-15.

Agencies came together to develop methods for joint planning and joint financing which, in the days when services were predominantly voluntary, were considered "two sides of the same coin." This approach necessitated use of fact-finding, agency and community studies, and budgeting and promotional procedures.

3. Next evolved attempts to adjust and relate the resources of agencies, both public and voluntary, to the needs of people. This was sharpened by the Lane report at the 1939 Conference of Social Work on "The Field of Community Organization."<sup>1</sup>

So far as methods were concerned, we had the development of the social statistics project, first operated by the United States Children's Bureau and later by Community Chests and Councils; and the "social breakdown index" which attempted to measure need by statistical evidence of the incidence of social problems. A pioneer effort of bringing to bear on identified problems the full

<sup>1</sup> Robert P. Lane, "The Field of Community Organization," in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 1939 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), pp. 495-511.

artillery of social services on an integrated basis was the Tremont Area Project in Cleveland followed by other community demonstrations, of which Bradley Buell is the current chief exponent.

4. Community organization was next seen as a method not only for meeting but for preventing social problems—getting at “causative factors” in the community. This meant looking to a broader participation of organizations and groups in the planning and action program extending the scope of program concern, as well as to refinements in the process used by the professional worker.

In regard to process, we had the contributions to the 1947 National Conference of Kenneth Pray<sup>2</sup> who identified the community organization practitioner as the “enabler” who works with, and not “on,” the community; and Wilber Newstetter<sup>3</sup> who identified the “intergroup” process as the “to-and-from” interaction involving representative and delegate roles in community organization. Important to the development of social work practice were the contributions of such organizations as United Community Funds and Councils of America, Inc. (formerly Community Chests and Councils) in policy statements and guides to various community organization methodology; the Association for the Study of Community Organization which under Arthur Dunham’s leadership from 1946 to 1955 stimulated discussion and interest in professional practice; and the National Social Welfare Assembly activities on the national agency level.

5. Most recently, community organization is seen as a direct service to communities through which individuals and groups representing a cross section of diversified special interests are helped to work together to identify and meet their own needs by participating as effective parts of a democratic society. The goal here is to achieve an integrated community through the broad involvement on a meaningful basis at every level of participation of the many appropriate groups and subgroups in the community concerned with a common problem.

Evidence of this may be found in the neighborhood approach

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth L. M. Pray, “What Is Community Organization Social Work Practice?” in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), pp. 194–204.

<sup>3</sup> Wilber I. Newstetter, “The Social Intergroup Work Process,” *ibid.*, pp. 205–17.

to community planning and the recognition given it in the 1950 policy statement of Community Chests and Councils which identified a role of councils as providing staff consultation service:

To assist organizations and individuals to improve social conditions in the districts or neighborhoods in which they work; to relate local planning efforts through appropriate channels and resources to community wide planning; to keep community wide services sensitive to local needs, and to stimulate maximum use and support of community services and resources to meet and prevent health and welfare problems.

Other evidences of this approach are found in the programs of United Community Defense Services to new and unserved areas in the United States; and community development programs at the international level. It is in this direct service approach that the social sciences and social work begin to work together more consciously; and that city planning and social work planning are seen as interdependent. In a recent book by Murray Ross this concept is sharpened.<sup>4</sup>

These five approaches are not mutually exclusive; rather, as a continuum, they are all still necessary and in effect in most community planning organizations. The evolution is expressed through a broadening and deepening of goals and by placing different degrees of weight or emphasis on their various aspects.

It should be noted further that throughout this history, but with increasing intensity as both centralized public and federated voluntary financing of services has reached substantial proportions, we have been faced with the major dilemma of a democracy. The question still to be resolved is how to achieve the advantages of centralization of planning, financing, and social policy and action, while at the same time preserving autonomy and the growth of diversity in the integral parts of the community structure.

If, indeed, there has been as much movement, fermentation, documentation, and practical experience as this paper would thus far indicate, why, you may ask, is there a tendency for community organization to be questioned as legitimate social work practice?

<sup>4</sup> Murray G. Ross, *Community Organization—Theory and Principles* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955).

In my judgment, its acceptance has been handicapped by:

1. Its historical roots in organizational structure which made it adjunct to, but not recognized as part of, social work practice since it was visualized as an indirect service to clients through agencies and reckoned as an administrative charge as a percentage of total welfare expenditures

2. The emphasis on medical and psychiatric concepts in case-work and identification with these older and established professions diverting social work from its earlier identification with the need to correct social injustice through social reform as a legitimate social work process

3. Disappointment with a seeming inability of community organization agencies to fulfill ambitious community goals such as finding panaceas for resolving difficult problems, or for providing sufficient services and financial support

4. The tendency to place full responsibility for failure on the community organization worker and organization while permitting them to take no credit for success

5. Failure to recognize that every social worker carries some responsibility for community organization practice, regardless of his area of specialization—and hence needs an exposure to knowledge of community organization process

6. The complexities of community structure, sociologically and organizationally, and the indirect role of the community organization worker, making it difficult for him to grasp his basic social work function and methodology

7. A traditional tendency to distrust centralization fortified by observed abuses of good professional practice in the use of manipulation of power to bring about change without appropriate and sufficient participation of autonomous groups and individuals directly involved

8. A tendency for some community organization practitioners to identify with volunteer leaders who represent at one and the same time his employers, constituents, and clients; and to dissociate himself from professional social workers as having a lower status.

Community organization as social work practice has its roots in

a philosophy common to all areas of social work specialization. Social work is a working expression of a democratic way of life; and democracy itself finds its aegis in a Judaic-Christian philosophy. Social work is characterized as a process which helps people solve their own problems. It recognizes and respects the rights of people to determine and to meet their individual needs to the extent of their ability, and their right to personal fulfillment. It further recognizes the interdependence of people and that the welfare of each affects the welfare of all. It knows that people find it natural and necessary to come together through association in the family, small groups, and special interest organizations. Social work, further, is based on the knowledge that the individual needs to be a part of the larger life of the community. This is most generally achieved as he becomes a member of a group which works with other groups to achieve common social objectives.

Social work is also based on a concept of growth and change; a recognition of the need for individuals, families, groups, and communities to adapt to new conditions and standards of human well-being through a continuous readjustment of personal and family life and social institutions.

The full expression of our democratic ideal demands that the right to self-determination and the autonomy of individuals and organizations must be neatly balanced against the common good of the majority. Social work, then, becomes a necessary service to those individuals, groups, or segments of a community which unassisted may fall into difficulty or fail to reach their full potential development in this process of change and adjustment. The recipients of this service we refer to as our clients; thus the client becomes the individual or family, the group, or the community. It follows that the client is always a person or people—human beings; and that no matter in which of these three settings they come to the attention of the professional social worker, inevitably they must be seen and helped in the other two aspects of their relationships. For example, fully to help the individual, the social caseworker must know about his relationships to his family, his social and economic groups, and his role in the community. The group must be seen by the group worker as an entity, but also as a

33

44



collection of individuals and in its relationship to other groups in the community. The community, in turn, must be worked with by the community organization worker in terms of its over-all characteristics, personality, and problems as expressed in the interaction of groups and individuals, but to do so involves understanding organizational patterns of group life and working both with organized groups and with individuals.

42 Thus we see casework, group work, and community organization all identified as related parts of social work practice. The common core is found in a disciplined use of self in working with people; a common working philosophy; in an emphasis on working with (not for) clients; a problem-centered approach; in the use of social diagnosis based on analysis of the articulation of the problem and the facts; in formulation of a plan toward solution or action; continuous evaluation; and in the fact that each area of specialization is involved in varying degrees with interpersonal, group, and intergroup process.

Now let us take a closer look at the way community organization practice fits into this generic pattern of social work. We have claimed that the client of the community organization worker is the community; but then follows the inevitable question: "How do we define community?" It will help clarify our thinking if we recognize that everyone is related to a number of communities. A community is characterized by two major factors: first, it is a formalized constellation of subgroups and individuals who share a common interest which brings them into relationship with each other; and it has geographical boundaries which may or may not also describe political units, and which may be as small as a neighborhood or as broad as a metropolitan area, or larger region of the state, nation, or world. Indeed, there are frequently communities within a community, necessitating a complex of relationships.

For individuals or organized groups to function as part of a community requires an organizational structure inclusive of common areas of interest and having some geographical limitations. People can cooperate effectively only through an effective form of



social organization which provides suitable channels of communication. When the organization is serving the interest of a number of groups in a community, it must provide for methods of representation to and from these groups. When the common interest of the planning body is to promote social welfare objectives, it may look to a community organization practitioner in social work to help it identify its problems and move toward its goals.

In the diagnosis of a community problem the worker first must know the environmental facts in the social situation including: familiarity with the economic base of the community's life as reflected in its industrial, labor, and business patterns; sociocultural patterns such as class lines, minority groups, religious organization, ethnic groups, its customs and attitudes; its population characteristics as to age and sex distribution; the program and structure of its major social institutions, including differences and likenesses in services and approaches to problems, auspices and quality and size of staff service. In this area, community organization needs to borrow heavily from the social sciences, not for the purpose of performing analytical studies of the community as an end in themselves, but as necessary tools for helping the community relate its strength to attainable goals on which diverse interest groups can find common concern. This also requires a basic knowledge of fact-gathering and research methods and development of work habits of applying a research approach to the daily operation of planning as well as to special study projects. 35

A factual case picture of the community is sterile indeed unless it takes into account the psychodynamics of intergroup relations. The attitudes of groups toward each other will depend in large part upon their various value systems and goals, their historical development, the quality of leadership, the nature of membership, and social status factors. Facilitating purposeful group interaction involves professional knowledge and skill. In order to help the community to gather and assess facts for the purpose of defining and determining solutions to its problems, it is necessary to know which are the appropriate groups to involve in a given

situation; how to time the planning steps from initiation of study to taking action on findings; when to draw what resources into the situation from within and outside the community; when to give positive or aggressive leadership and when to play a passive, supporting role; and ability to accept the well-considered decision of community leadership even at the risk of letting it make serious mistakes. Necessary to this process is the worker's ability to empathize with the community by feeling with various groups the meaning the problem has for them in terms of their own history, goals, and objectives; and at the same time being able to analyze the situation objectively so as to help the groups interact positively and move toward desirable goals.

19 Implicit in this professional skill is a knowledge of group process. Sensitivity to the interaction of members of a committee is doubly important when the committee itself is representative of other separate group interests. It is often said that the committee is the primary tool of community organization, just as is the interview for casework or group process for group work. In addition to the mechanics of getting the committee set up with an appropriate, clear-cut charge and with clear lines of responsibility within the organization, the skill of the worker rests in influencing the composition of the committee and his disciplined use of himself in its deliberations. It is necessary to understand and work with the differences and tensions that arise, to recognize subgroups, and direct and indirect leadership roles. Although this knowledge is based in group work, it is not used for the primary purpose of assisting individuals or the group to grow through group experience or achievement; rather the concern is with furthering movement in community process toward broader objectives.

And back of intergroup and group process is an understanding of the psychodynamics of individual behavior. The community organization practitioner must be able to relate to and accept all kinds of people regardless of this economic, social, political, religious, or other position. He must be able to recognize and interpret the meaning of aggression, defenses, and hostility; know how to ease tensions and create opportunity for healthy ego satis-

faction. This knowledge and skill he uses toward his goal of expediting the achievement of community-selected objectives and not on an intensive basis of casework services to assist an individual to resolve personal problems. Much of the work of community organization goes on outside of, and between, group meetings in conference, consultation, and interview where this knowledge and skill are of prime importance.

In the intergroup process the worker needs skill in stimulating participation and involvement not only of representatives but also of the groups they represent. This presumes clarity on the difference between the role of instructed delegate, the organization-selected representative, and an at-large representative of a point of view. Meaningful interaction between groups does not just happen when their representatives are physically at the same place. Facilitating methods must be applied skillfully and with professional self-discipline. The end result of this intergroup process is not just the reshaping of community services or the raising of standards, important as they are; there is also an intangible factor of a changing community morale or climate in which a spirit of mutuality makes for greater ease in reaching and extending future goals.

A community organization worker, no matter at which level of community he practices, must encourage interaction between planning organizations on the same horizontal plane and also vertically as between planes. For example, a community-wide council cannot hope to effect changes through the efforts alone of a top-level committee, no matter how expert and powerful the members may be. To achieve broad use and support of services, and indeed to assure that these services meet a genuinely felt need, it is important to involve participation in planning at district and neighborhood levels as well; and to provide channels for intercommunication and interaction between these district councils and between the district plane of activity and the city-wide plane.

Time does not permit a look at the tools necessary to the social worker's community organization kit. Suffice it to say that these must include research, public relations and interpretation, legislative and social action procedures, fund-raising and budgeting

techniques, recording and administration. The proper use of each of these tools necessitates community involvement and affects movement in process.

Just as in casework and group work, the community organization process is not an end in itself; it is problem-centered and is an effort to achieve movement toward solution of the problem. Although it starts at the point of readiness of the community to accept and understand some facets of the problem, it moves toward broader goals through the knowledge, understanding, and skill of the worker. His professional facilitating role will depend on the choice of methods he applies to the problem and his body of knowledge about sound organization, program content, administration, and social policy. Community organization is a dynamic concept in which change is brought about through helping people to reorient their attitudes toward themselves and others, toward programs and problems and to mobilize their forces to effect their chosen goals. This is the antithesis of a community association created and managed by experts to achieve preconceived goals.

Community organization becomes a direct service when the community, as a dynamic, living organism, becomes the client needing help with social integration and seeking service from the worker. The community organization worker, then, must be prepared to offer his professional skill in relation to the clients' ability to use him and on problems which the community recognizes as important. The worker's effectiveness will grow with community understanding of his role, as he enables individuals and groups to make greater use of potential resources and to create a climate in which people and groups have significance and importance in their community.

This direct service, to be effective, must be offered on a community-wide basis and be so structured as to reach the several levels of administrative responsibility as well as to have broad geographical coverage. It must be flexible, and available on request of city-wide or local groups.

As in all fields of social work, helping with problems of human

relationships is always difficult when the situation has reached a state of crisis. The community organization worker is learning this, too, as he is assigned to help resolve intergroup tension situations involving such difficult matters as racial, nationality, or class conflict. In such situations we find the worker moving in to help a subcommunity as it struggles to meet a crisis and serving to isolate or minimize the difficulty as a protection to the larger community. This aspect of community organization has overtones of what has become known as "aggressive" social work. As community organization workers are more readily available to assist the community, both as generalists and as consultants in specialized fields of service, they can serve an important role in prevention not only of crisis but of community deterioration.

Evidence of the "direct service approach" at the community-wide level is found in the great ferment in community welfare councils over a project or problem-centered approach to planning to replace or supplement the cumbersome functional agency-centered divisions. It is argued that the various organized groups and citizen leaders of a community who must be involved in the planning process to achieve sound results can identify with a familiar problem but that they find little meaning or way to relate to interagency divisional structure; and even those councils which continue to have divisions are expanding membership to include citizen groups and are developing projects on community problems which cut across fields of service. The scope of council program is constantly broadened and begins to include such problems as housing, race relations, vice, and crime.

A growing number of councils in various sized cities are offering not only the help of specialized consultants on a central staff but also the services of community organization generalists as consultants to work with areas, neighborhoods, and local groups which are struggling to find solutions to welfare problems.

A new and growing development is tax-supported community organization service under governmental auspice. This is found in the departments of welfare in Baltimore and Kansas City, in youth boards in New York City and in California; and in separate

community organization service departments of the county in San Diego and Los Angeles.

Much attention has been given in recent years to the need for a closer working relationship between social welfare planning and city planning, housing authorities, schools, human relations commissions. A natural and needed link has been found in those communities which offer to all central planning bodies channels of communication directly to people through a network of community councils staffed by community organization practitioners whether working under voluntary or public auspices.

The concept of community development as encouraged through the United Nations and as translated into program in many less developed areas of the world reflects the application of this same philosophy and approach.

57 Community organization practitioners, like those in other fields of social work, are finding an important place in non-social work settings. Housing associations and housing authorities have recognized community organization service as an integral part of their programs. In fact, community organization workers are needed to carry out Point 7 of the Workable Program for Urban Renewal under the Housing Act of 1954 which requires that any political entity which wishes to participate in federally aided programs for the renewal of blighted areas of a city must provide in its planning for "community-wide participation on the part of individuals and representative citizen organizations which will help to provide both in the community generally and in selected areas the understanding and support which is necessary to insure success." City planning commissions are also employing community organization consultants to advise them on the human relationship and social service aspects of their work.

These jobs, often operating at the neighborhood level and under supervision, open up new opportunities for community organization practice for people with limited experience in social work. This development offers a challenge to schools of social work in terms of criteria for selection of community organization students and in development of appropriate curriculum content and field work assignments. It is significant that city planners,



housing authorities and associations, and city departments for community organization are turning to the schools of social work for people with a community organization major.

We also might well look to boards of education, courts, rehabilitation centers, and health departments as fields in which community organization is a recognized skill, and where there is need for closer collaboration with social work, both in training and as a member of the team of professional service workers.

For years, the community organization specialist has complained about the casework or group work practitioners' lack of community awareness, interest in broad social policy, and readiness to speak out and act on social issues. When councils have been weak, frequently the difficulty can be traced to the lethargy of its professional members.

Many caseworkers either fail to see their role as including help to the client in establishing satisfying relationships beyond the family, or they are reluctant to do so. Referral of a client with a housing problem to a community council or housing association through which he can contribute to the solution of his own and the community's problem is seldom considered.

The focus of recent years on the generic aspects of social work is putting a renewed emphasis on group and community process. Although community organization as a primary function of social work is still conceded to be an area of specialization, it is recognized that every social worker carries a secondary responsibility for community organization. To do so adequately will require a reorganization of class and field work. Some of us believe that we need a required course or sequence that would parallel that required of all students on the dynamics of human growth and development and which would examine the dynamics of community growth and development.

As we have noted, community organization as social work practice has a philosophy, methods, and skills. It serves a client—the community—with a direct service worthy of support in its own right, and not just as a hidden charge against family, child welfare, recreation, health, or other services. Community organization is not only professionally respectable as social work practice; it must



make significant strides to keep abreast of the increasing demands being made upon it. It is therefore with deep gratification that we look to the newly organized Committee on Community Organization of the National Association of Social Workers and the interest expressed in the Council on Social Work Education in its curriculum study and its workshops as the means to hammering out the basic concepts and charting a future course as a guide to the continued development of community organization practice in social work.

## *The Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lectures*

AGAIN THIS YEAR the National Conference of Social Work presented three lectures by social scientists at its Annual Forum. The basic purpose of these lectures has been to use the forum facilities of the Conference for the promotion of more effective collaboration between social work and the social sciences. The program has been made possible by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation.

### DEMOGRAPHY AND HUMAN ECOLOGY IN RELATION TO SOCIAL WORK

by *PHILIP M. HAUSER*

TO THE SOCIAL WORKER, sociology is but one of the several sciences which provide basic knowledge of potential usefulness in dealing with social work problems. The sociologist as a scientist is concerned only with adding to sociology's fund of knowledge products of research which permit prediction and control of the phenomena subjected to investigation. The social worker, in contrast, is concerned with facing and solving specific social problems—of the community, the neighborhood, the family, or the person. The social worker in dealing with concrete problems uses whatever relevant knowledge may be available from any or all of the sciences; and when no scientific knowledge is avail-

able, which is often the case, the social worker draws on a fund of professional and personal experience and common sense.

The social worker in relation to the sociologist parallels the relationship of the engineer to the physicist. The former is action-oriented; the latter is research-minded. The former must make value judgments in forming policy and planning action; the latter is concerned only with existential and instrumental judgments. Sometimes the existential and instrumental relationships produced by scientific research are directly useful to the engineer; sometimes the products of research are useful only through the ingenious adaptation of an imaginative engineer; often the products of research serve no immediate engineering purpose.

35 Although there are a number of subfields of sociology that have relevance to the problems of social workers—for example, social organization; social change and social disorganization; social psychology; human ecology; and demography—this paper is mainly restricted to the consideration of human ecology and demography in their relation to the problems of health and welfare agencies.

36 Human ecology, in a way, may be regarded as a specialized interest within the subfield of social organization. It is concerned with the spatial, temporal, and sustenance relations of population aggregates, human behavior, and social institutions. Research in human ecology has dealt largely with such problems as the structure and growth of urban and metropolitan areas; the delineation of natural areas; the spatial patterns of social phenomena including delinquency, desertion, divorce, public assistance, mental disorders, disease, and changes in population type and land use; and the various factors underlying these phenomena and the processes by which they came about.

Demography is so closely allied that with human ecology it is often regarded as a single subfield. It is concerned with the study of population size, growth, composition, and population changes as they are influenced by or influence the social order. Specific research includes studies of fertility, mortality, migration; family growth and composition; population composition, including age, sex, color or race, social and economic status and the like and

changes therein; and the interrelations of demographic, social, and economic factors.

Instead of describing the types of data and research which the demographer and ecologist have made available, a summary of actual findings for the United States will be presented that provide a background for better understanding many of the social problems of the past and present; and projections will be discussed which provide a basis for anticipating some of the problems of the future.

The rapidity with which the population of the United States has grown is a major factor underlying many of our contemporary social problems. Because we have been, and still are, living in the midst of rates of population growth which are almost unique in the perspective of human habitation of this globe, it is difficult to comprehend their meaning and implications.

In the short span of 160 years between the first census of the United States in 1790 and the seventeenth decennial census in 1950, the population of the nation doubled five times, increasing from less than 4 million to 151 million persons.<sup>1</sup> During the nineteenth century the population increased at an average of about 14 percent per year, and since 1900 has averaged an annual increase of over 2 percent. Although the rate of growth declined during the first part of this century to a low of 0.7 percent increase per year during the depression 1930s, it rose again with the post-war boom in marriages and births to average about 2 percent from 1946 through 1955. The phenomenal character of population increase in the United States is made clear, perhaps, when we realize that between the birth of Christ and the beginning of the modern era, 1650, it is likely that the population of the world increased at a rate of about 5 or 6 percent per century.

The difference between a population increase of 14 percent per year during the nineteenth century, or even 2 percent per year

<sup>1</sup> Most of the general census statistics in this paper were obtained or derived from the following publications of the U.S. Bureau of the Census:

*U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part I, United States Summary* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953); *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955* (76th ed.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955); *Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954).

during this century, and 5 or 6 percent per century is undoubtedly a significant index of the difference between relatively stable and unstable social orders. Moreover, not only is rapid population growth apt to produce greater social and personal disorganization, reflected in the work load of the social worker, but also it places a strain upon health and welfare agencies themselves, which must expand to keep up with population growth.

Despite the tremendous population growth of the United States the birth rate has been declining throughout most of the period for which measurements of fertility are available. In fact, the United States shares with France such distinction as there may be in being the first modern nations to record large declines in fertility. The crude birth rate of the United States, estimated at 55 in 1800, decreased to 30 by 1900, and dropped to a record low of about 17 at the bottom of the depression in 1932. During the postwar period, when the birth rate climbed back to a level of about 26, it was only about half of the 1800 level.

Another measurement of fertility, the ratio of children under five years of age to women of child-bearing age, gives a better picture of the meaning of variations in the birth rate in terms of child-rearing responsibilities of women. In 1800, for example, each 1,000 women twenty to forty-four years of age had 1,342 children under five; by 1850, 892 children; and by 1900, only 666. In 1940, reflecting the dampening effects of the depression, children under five per 1,000 women twenty to forty-four years old numbered only 419. In 1950 the figure had increased to 516, still well below half the level in 1800. This brief overview of changes in fertility in the United States is a quantification of one of the tremendous changes in American family life which have had important social repercussions.

There have been, also, significant short-run changes in fertility which merit attention as significant factors in the shifting character of social problems and the work load of the social worker. The great fluctuation in birth rates between the depression thirties and the wartime forties has produced first a great gap and then a bulge in our population pyramid which will have profound effects

on many aspects of American life for at least several generations to come—including important implications for social work.

The population of the United States has grown rapidly despite the decline in fertility because of the even greater decline in mortality and because of immigration. Historical data on mortality are more difficult to pull together than historical data on fertility. Statistics for Massachusetts, however, which can be taken in a general way to depict what has happened in this country, indicate a decline in the crude death rate of about 60 percent between 1789 and 1950, from a level of about 28 to a little over 10.<sup>2</sup> This comparison tends to understate the actual decrease in mortality because the population of Massachusetts in 1789 was considerably younger than that in 1950.

Decreases in the death rate are reflected in increased life expectancies. White males in Massachusetts in 1789 had at birth an expectation of less than thirty-five years of life. By 1900 this figure had increased to over forty-six years, and by 1950, to about sixty-seven years. For the United States as a whole, life expectation for males at birth increased from a level of about forty-one in 1830-60 to about sixty-seven years by 1950. In 1950, expectation of life for the white female in the United States was over seventy-two years. Thus we can say, roughly, that life expectancy in the United States about doubled between 1800 and 1950. The doubling of years of life has, of course, also greatly altered the nature of social, family, and personal problems.

The decline in mortality has not been evenly distributed over the span of life. Most of the gain in expectation of life has resulted from the decrease in infant and child mortality and the conquest of the parasitic and infectious diseases. For example, between 1900 and 1950 infant mortality declined by over 80 percent, whereas mortality at ages sixty-five to seventy-five years decreased by only about 27 percent. Moreover, female mortality declined more rapidly than male mortality so that the gap between male and female expectation of life has increased. The differential

<sup>2</sup> L. I. Dublin, A. J. Lotka, and M. Spiegelman, *Length of Life* (New York: Ronald Press, 1949). Chap. 4.

declines in death rates by age and by sex have also had important implications for health and welfare agencies since they affect the number and composition of families broken by death, and the number and characteristics of survivors at all ages as well as at the older ages.

The United States has contributed one of the most dramatic chapters to human history in its receipt of some 40 million immigrants of record between 1820 and 1950. Moreover, all of the non-Indian population in 1820, some 9.6 million persons, were immigrants or descendants of immigrants; and many persons have entered the country, especially across our southern land boundary, without becoming immigrants of record.

Throughout our history, immigration has been a major contributing factor to community, institutional, and personal problems. Uprooted from their own cultural backgrounds, immigrants have universally been faced with problems of accommodation and assimilation—processes which endure for at least several generations. The more recent waves of immigrants, those who entered since 1900, have come from Southern and Eastern Europe—from cultures more divergent from the American way of life than those of Central and Northwestern Europe from which our earlier immigrants came. But each of our major waves of immigration has produced a whole series of problems, many of which called for the services of the social agencies.

With the sharp reduction in immigration during the First World War and the passage of our immigration quota law in the 1920s, immigration ceased to be an important factor in United States population growth. Even the relatively small trickle of immigration, however, not to mention the special groups of refugees who have been admitted to the country, continues to be of direct interest to the social worker in many areas.

43 *Ethnicity and race.*—Although the volume of immigration has been heavy, the foreign-born themselves never exceeded 15 percent of the total population of the United States at any one of our decennial censuses. The foreign white stock, however—the foreign-born plus natives of foreign or mixed parentage—made up



35 percent of the total population in 1910, but have been decreasing in proportion ever since. Needless to say, the social work load in the early decades of this century in large measure consisted of problems of the foreign white stock.

The American Negro represents a special problem because he is racially different from the majority of our population and has, for historical reasons, been isolated from the American way of life. From 1790 to 1810 the Negro constituted about one fifth of our population. Since 1810 the Negro has been a decreasing portion of the total population, declining continuously to a level of about 10 percent in 1930—a percentage which has remained quite stable since.

At the outbreak of the Civil War about 92 percent of the Negroes in the United States lived in the South. By 1910, this proportion had decreased only to 89 percent. Moreover, in 1910 only 27 percent of the Negroes lived in urban areas. Only since 1910 have the Negroes become a mass problem to social workers; because it is only since then that the Negroes left the South in large numbers and migrated to the cities of the North and West, where social work is more available.

By 1950 the proportion of Negroes in the South had declined to 68 percent; and 62 percent of the Negroes in the United States lived in cities. In 1950 in the northeast and north central regions of the country 94 percent, and in the West 90 percent, of the Negroes lived in urban areas; whereas in the South in 1950 about 48 percent were urban.

*Age structure.*—The decreases in birth rates, death rates, and immigration have greatly aged the population of the United States. In 1800 the average American was under sixteen years of age; by 1950, he was over thirty.

Between 1900 and 1950 the median age of our population increased by over seven years, rising from 22.9 to 30.1 years. During this same period the proportion of the population under five years of age decreased from 12.1 to 10.5 percent, rising in 1950 as a result of the postwar baby boom from a low of 8.0 percent in 1940. The population sixty-five years old and older, in contrast,

28

2

increased continuously from 4.1 to 8.7 percent of the total. During the first half of this century, while our total population doubled, the number of our citizens sixty-five and over quadrupled.

The rapidly changing age structure of the population has produced great shifts in the relation of population of "productive" age to that of "dependent" age. In 1870, for example, there were 111 persons of "dependent" age—that is, persons under twenty or sixty-five and over—for each 100 persons of productive age—age twenty to sixty-four. By 1900 the number of dependents per 100 productive persons had decreased to 94, and by 1950 to 72. This decrease, however, was made up of conflicting components. Between 1870 and 1950 the number of dependents under 20 per 100 productive persons decreased from 105 to 58, whereas the number of older dependents more than doubled increasing from 6 to 14.

The changing age structure of the United States has, of course, had significant impact on the programs of social agencies. The long-time decline in the proportion of young people and the long-time increase in the proportion of old people has affected the allocation of resources and services. The increasing number and proportions of older persons have created a new field of social services to parallel the specialization of geriatrics in medicine; and also a new field for research, namely, gerontology. As a result of the postwar birth rate, social agencies have been forced to revitalize and expand youth programs while developing programs for rapidly increasing older populations.

A fundamentally important aspect of population composition is that relating to labor force participation. Labor force participation is not only the key to the maintenance of income flow for most of the population but also is an important factor in the person's total adjustment to the family and the community, and an integral element in the organization and integrity of his own personality.

The proportion of the total population fourteen years of age and over in the labor force has remained stable throughout the first half of this century, ranging from about 54 to 57 percent. This stability seems quite remarkable when one considers the changes which have occurred in our economy and society and in

the composition of the population. Yet, the stability of this measurement obscures highly significant age and sex changes which have tended to offset one another.

Since 1900 the proportion of females 14 years of age and over who were workers increased from about 20 to 21, to 32 percent.<sup>3</sup> This increase occurred despite the decrease in labor force activity among women under 20. It resulted from a great increase in the participation of women 20 to 64 years of age, including married women, especially those whose children were above preschool age. There is a tendency for women to leave the labor force during their period of greatest fertility and to reenter the labor force at age 35, after their children reach school age.

During the same period the proportion of males 14 and over in the labor force decreased. The decrease resulted from the sharp decline in the labor force participation of males under 20 and those 65 and over. Between 1920 and 1950, for example, the proportion of males 14 to 19 in the labor force decreased from about 56 to 48 percent; and that of men 65 and over, from 57 to 45 percent.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the increased participation of women was almost a direct offset to the decreased labor force participation of young and old males.

These basic changes in work patterns have, needless to say, affected many aspects of social work. The period of prolonged schooling for the young; the increased employment of married women, including mothers; the earlier retirement of older workers—all have had direct and significant effects on social work loads in respect to problems ranging from juvenile delinquency, nursery care for children of working mothers, to the personal needs of older persons confronted with the adjustments of compulsory retirement.

The size of the family in the United States, as measured by population per household reported by the census, decreased from

<sup>3</sup> Philip M. Hauser, "Mobility in Labor Force Participation," in E. Wight Bakke et al., *Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity* (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1954), pp. 8-47.

<sup>4</sup> The historical comparisons are subject to some error because of differences between "gainful worker" and "labor force" data.

(16)

5.8 in 1790 to 3.5 persons in 1950. Even the baby boom failed to increase the number of persons per household between 1940 and 1950, when it decreased from 3.8 to 3.5 persons. Although the prolonged baby boom has resulted in a slight upturn in persons per household during this decade, the probabilities are high that the average size of household in 1960 will be below that in 1950.

The decreasing size of the household explains the greater percentage increase in households than in population reported by the census. In every decade for which the data are available, since 1890, the average annual percentage increase in households has exceeded that of total population. Between 1900 and 1950 while the total population of the nation increased by about 2 percent per year, the number of households increased by about 3.5 percent per year.

The rate of increase of households is largely a function of new family formation which is affected both by the changing age structure of the population and by the marriage rate. The crude marriage rate (marriages per 1,000 population) reached an all-time high in the United States during the 1940s, reaching a level of 16.4 in 1946 as a result of unprecedented prosperity and the impact of the war and demobilization. The high level and duration of the postwar marriage boom has produced record highs in the proportion of the population married. For example, whereas only 53 percent of the males 14 and over were married in 1900, about 71 percent were married in 1950; corresponding percentages for females 14 years and older were 55 and 66. Even when the population is standardized to take the changing age structure into account, the increase in proportion of men and women married during the first half of this century remains considerable.<sup>5</sup>

These figures are but external quantitative indexes of the great changes which have taken place in the American family. Additional statistics are available which help to document other aspects of these changes. Perhaps the most significant of these data are their relation to changes in the "family cycle."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For males, the standardized percentages are 57 and 66, respectively; for females, 57 and 65 percent. See *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955*.

<sup>6</sup> The basic work on the "family cycle" has been done by Dr. Paul C. Glick of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. His articles from which these data are summarized are:

In 1890 the average first marriage was contracted by a groom of 26.1 years of age with a bride of 22.0 years. By 1950, age at marriage had decreased to 22.8 years for the groom and 20.1 years for the bride. The decline in age at marriage was also accompanied by a decline in age at birth of first child. In 1890 the average wife was about 23 years old at the birth of her first child; by 1950 she was 22.5 years old.<sup>7</sup> Of greater significance, perhaps, is the decline in average age of parents at the birth of the last child. In 1890 the average wife was 31.9 years old and the average husband 36.0 years at the birth of the last child; by 1950, despite the postwar boom in births, both parents were well under 30 at the birth of their last child, with the wife having an average age of 26.0 years and the husband 28.7 years.

The earlier departure of children from the family fold is indicated by the decline in age of parents at marriage of the last child. Between 1890 and 1950 the average age of the wife at marriage of the last child decreased from 55.3 to 47.5 years; and the average age of the husband decreased from 59.4 to 50.2 years.

Improved mortality resulted in increases in the ages of husband or wife at the death of a spouse. Between 1890 and 1950 the average age of the wife at the death of her husband increased from 53.3 to 61.4 years; the average age of the husband at the death of his wife increased from 57.4 to 64.1 years. Finally, decreased death rates also increased the average age at death of the surviving spouse—from 67.7 to 77.2 years from 1890 to 1950 for the surviving wife; and from 66.4 to 71.6 years for the surviving husband.

These statistics measure great changes in family living and the nature of interpersonal relations in the family that have altered the nature of family social problems. For example, between 1890 and 1950 the average duration of a first marriage before dissolution by death increased from about 31 to 41 years. The period of freedom from child-bearing by the average wife—that is, the period between the birth of her last child and end of life—increased by over 40 percent, from about 36 to 51 years. In 1890 the

<sup>7</sup> "The Life Cycle of the Family," *Marriage and Family Living*, XVII (1955), 3-9; "The Family Cycle," *American Sociological Review*, XII (1947), 164-72.

<sup>8</sup> This comparison is subject to error because of inadequacies of the data.

average wife still had an unmarried child at home at the death of her husband. By 1950, the average couple had fourteen years of life together after their last child had married. The period of survival after the death of the spouse increased somewhat for the wife and decreased for the husband during this period.

These changes in the composition of the biological family in the course of the family cycle are also accompanied by economic changes and by changes in living arrangements. For example, the spatial mobility of families decreases and home ownership increases with the age of the family head. Family income rises to a plateau between the ages of about 35 to 54 and declines thereafter. At the peak, average family income is about 40 percent above the level of the newly formed family. After the head reaches 65, family income declines to about half of its peak. Sharing living quarters with adult relatives increases with the age of the family head, especially over age 45. Among about one fourth of American couples whose head is under 35, both husband and wife are in the labor force. When the head is between 35 and 54 years of age, this percentage increases to about 30 percent—reflecting the decreased child-rearing obligations of women as their children reach school age. Male unemployment has its lowest incidence among married heads with wife present.

These are but a few of the demographic facts which profoundly affect family interpersonal relations, and the nature of many personal, family, and community patterns of behavior and problems—including the problems which call for the attention of the social worker.

Even more dramatic than the growth of our total population has been the growth of urban population. In 1790 there were only 24 urban places in the United States; these contained a total of 200,000 persons, or only 5 percent of the total population. By 1950, there were 4,741 cities containing a total of 96.5 million persons, or 64 percent of the nation's inhabitants.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, in 1950, 168 standard metropolitan areas included 84.5 million persons, or well over half the total population. Between 1940 and

<sup>8</sup> The 1950 data are for the "new" urban definition, not strictly comparable with the "old" used for 1790. The difference does not matter for the purposes of this paper.



1950, under the special impact of our expanded war economy, metropolitan area growth absorbed over 80 percent of total growth in the United States. The populations of these areas during this decade increased by 22 percent, while in nonmetropolitan areas the increase was only 6 percent.

In these statistics are reflected undoubtedly the most profound change which has occurred in the United States in the course of the nation's history—the shift from a rural, agricultural to an urban, industrial way of life. In fact, it is in the increase of “urbanism as a way of life” (to use a phrase made famous by Louis Wirth)<sup>9</sup> that the basic *raison d'être* for modern social work is to be found. For, although it is undeniably true that the city is identified with most of what we regard as the fruit of Western civilization, including science and the arts as well as technology, the city has also had its costs—social and personal as well as economic—much of which is reflected in the programs of private and public welfare agencies. It is in the city, at least in its manifestations in the United States, that the combination of rapid technological change and the admixture of heterogeneous peoples and cultures has greatly speeded up the tempo of social change and, therefore, of social and personal disorganization.

Just as the person is viewed by the sociologist as the subjective aspect of culture, so may personal disorganization be regarded as the subjective aspect of social disorganization. The juvenile delinquent and the criminal are subjective manifestations of the breakdown of inherited social controls. They are symptoms of the deteriorating influence in the urban environment of such social institutions as the family and the church, of the waning grip of our mores, of the present inadequacy of the new controls represented by such substitutes for the informal control of the mores as the school, the court, the prison, and the reformatory.

The neurotic, the victim of the nervous breakdown, the alcoholic, and the suicide reflect the strains, pressures, and crises imposed on the person by cultural maladjustments creating social situations with which the person cannot cope. Prostitution and

<sup>9</sup> Louis Wirth, *Community Life and Social Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), pp. 110-33.



other forms of sex vice in large measure flow from the basic maladjustment between the insistent biological and emotional urges of mankind, and a social heritage and sex mores which do not provide adequate acceptable channels of conduct. The pauper, the unemployed, the aged dependent, are some of the by-products of rapid change and attendant frictions in our economic organization and in its impact on other aspects of total social organization.

The urban environment which is associated with contemporary social and personal problems has also witnessed the emergence of new controls designed to cope with them, of which social work is an important example. Social work as a field and the social worker, both private and public, may in fact be viewed as social inventions which have been designed to deal with the new problems manifest in the urban environment with which our mores and our traditional institutions could not cope.

It is not possible within the limits of this paper to relate the various forms of social work specifically to the community, family, and personal problems precipitated by the development of our urban, industrial civilization. But it is desirable to trace at least two broad types of problems representing perhaps the most acute complexes of social problems to be found in contemporary urban U.S.A. These concern, first, the problems of the urban slum; and second, the problems associated with the great increase in the immigration of Negroes from the South to the cities of the North and West.

The city slum has long been a national disgrace and a disproportionate contributor to social work problems. It has become today a major political issue and a focal problem which has led, perhaps, to the greatest mobilization of ideas, men, and resources ever assembled to deal with a peacetime social problem. The demographer and the ecologist, as well as the sociologist in general, have contributed much to an understanding of the slum which has pointed to the policies and programs needed to deal with its problems.

Among the factors which contribute to an explanation of the slum as an urban phenomenon are three which merit special mention here. These are: first, the rapidity of urban growth; second,

the nature of metropolitan area structure and change; third, the manner in which our cities have historically been peopled.

The fabulous character of urban population growth in this country has already been noted. Cities in the United States were built, not structure by structure, but rather by neighborhoods and even by whole communities. In consequence, the processes of aging and decay produced, not one obsolescent structure at a time, but rather entire decayed neighborhoods and communities. In perhaps an overly dramatic statement the physical aspects of slum and blight in our cities may be described as a twentieth-century hangover from a nineteenth-century growth spree.

Cities, originating at some central point or points associated with their economic base, necessarily grow outward. In consequence, the newer, more modern, more fashionable, and more desirable housing tends to be located toward the periphery of the city or metropolitan area; and the older, obsolescent, and less desirable housing tends to be located near the center or centers of the metropolis. In the competition for housing the lower income group tends to locate toward the center of the city and the higher, toward the periphery. Thus, social-economic status in the metropolitan complex tends to have a spatial dimension measured by distance from the center of town—usually the central business district.

Finally, cities in large measure, and especially in their early histories, grow through the receipt of population through migration. American cities were largely peopled by the successive waves of European immigrants who came to the United States primarily because of the greater economic opportunities. Newcomers to the city typically began their new life at the bottom of the economic and social ladder. For the typical immigrant or in-migrant to the city, the slum offered the only housing he could afford. It is for this reason that our successive immigrant waves in the last half of the nineteenth century—German, Irish, and Scandinavian—and in the first part of this century—Polish, Russian (largely Jewish), Italian, and others from Southern and Eastern Europe—found their areas of first settlement in our city slums.

Each immigrant group in our cities has been confronted with

the relatively long, slow, and tortuous process, both to the immigrant and to the city, of making an adjustment to urban life—usually from a rural as well as from a foreign background. Each newcomer group was received initially with some suspicion and hostility and subjected to prejudice and discriminatory practices by the people already here. Each, in turn, was designated by a derogatory appellation, usually short and pithy: "krauthead"; "Mick"; "dumb Swede"; "Dago"; "Polack"; "sheenie"; "Bohunk." Each of the immigrant groups was regarded as hopeless material for entering into the "American way of life" and American citizenship. But each of our immigrant groups has demonstrated that through the mysterious alchemy of the processes the sociologist calls "accommodation and assimilation" it can become completely indistinguishable from other Americans in the course of a few generations.

In becoming Americanized, and adapted to city life, each immigrant group has demonstrably changed its spatial location within the city and its general social and economic status. As the group worked its way up the economic and social ladder, its center of location moved toward the periphery of the city until it became widely or completely dispersed and disappeared into the community at large. This movement in space was accompanied by rising general socioeconomic status as measured by higher education, occupation, income, and associated characteristics.

The patterns of accommodation and assimilation which have characterized the settlement of European immigrants are now being followed by the American Negro. The greatly increased migration of rural Negroes to metropolitan areas, and especially to the cities of the North and West, may be likened to the earlier streams of European immigrants. The Negro too is moving to centers which offer better economic opportunity than he finds in his area of origin and which need him to man the expanding economy.

The flow of Negroes from the South to the North, which began in relatively large volume during the First World War, was greatly accelerated, and spread to the West as well as continuing

to the North, by the demand for labor generated by the requirements of the Second World War. For, in the Second World War, in building a gigantic war economy on top of a high-level civilian peacetime economy, we tremendously expanded our urban industrial plant and labor force.

For most Negroes this meant their first opportunity to enter into "the American way of life," even though, on the average, their roots went back further in American history than those of most of the white population. The adjustment of the Negro to city life in the North and West is following the same patterns, physically and socially, as those characteristic of the European immigrants. The Negro, of course, will not become indistinguishable from other Americans because his skin color does not change in the course of a few generations as does his economic and social status. This fact does make the problems of accommodation and assimilation more difficult; but that the process remains essentially the same is already evident in the adaptation made by First World War Negro in-migrants and their descendants.

The slum today, then, is peopled largely by Negroes—the newest of the in-migrants to the city—and it is the Negro's job to work his way up and out, as successive waves of immigrants before him have done or, to some extent, are still doing. His task may actually be easier than that which confronted some of his predecessors. This may be true because of several forces at work, including our sustained full-employment economy and our increasing efforts to eliminate blight from our cities, highlighted by the mobilization of laws, men, ideas, and resources in the "urban renewal" programs. The implications of this form of "intervention" into the "natural" processes which have produced our slums will be further discussed in connection with the consideration of future prospects.

Demographers and ecologists as well as other sociologists have also contributed knowledge bearing on a problem which in the past was referred to as the "quality" of the population, the problem of personal and group differences in characteristics and behavior. Although this problem derives from differences in heredity and environment, the sociologist has been among the social scien-

tists who have demonstrated that apart from specific forms of hereditary defects affecting very small parts of the population, the major differences in the behavior and abilities of diverse ethnic and racial groupings are traceable primarily to differences in social and economic opportunity. The researches of the ecologist and demographer have contributed materially to this conclusion.

22 For example, the tendency, a generation or so ago, to regard our Southeastern European immigrants and their descendants as inclined toward delinquency and crime because they had relatively high delinquency and crime rates was checked by the researches of the sociologists who showed that high delinquency and crime rates characterized the inhabitants of our slum areas whoever they might be at a particular time.<sup>10</sup> That is, any ethnic or racial group which was raised under slum conditions in our great urban centers would present grave problems in this respect as they worked their way up and out of the slum situation. The ecological studies conducted in many of our large metropolitan centers certainly demonstrated, among other things, that many group differentials in the types of problems which make up the work load of health and welfare agencies are attributable to differentials in social and economic opportunity of diverse population groupings and persons in our metropolitan areas.<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, the differences in regional "quality" of population as measured by group differences in education, occupational level, citizenship, and the like are traceable to regional differences in opportunity.<sup>12</sup> In this connection two major problems must be mentioned which account for a disproportionate share of the population requiring attention of health and welfare agencies.

The first relates to the patterns of differential fertility in the nation as a whole as well as regionally. For example, women of

<sup>10</sup> C. R. Shaw and H. D. McKay, *Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency*, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Causes of Crime, Vol. II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931); C. R. Shaw and H. D. McKay, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

<sup>11</sup> For summary of many of these studies see James A. Quinn, *Human Ecology* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1950), Part IV, pp. 399-541.

<sup>12</sup> National Resources Committee, *Problems of a Changing Population* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938), Part II, pp. 37-82.

completed fertility, in 1952, that is, women forty-five years old and over, had borne 36.7 million children. Although rural farm women made up only 16 percent of the total women with completed fertilities, they bore 22 percent of the children. Although women whose husbands had incomes of less than \$1,000 per year in 1951 made up 23 percent of all those with completed fertilities, they produced over 30 percent of all children borne. White women fifteen to forty-four years old in 1950 with less than eight years of schooling made up about 12 percent of all white women of this age, but had borne about 20 percent of the children. This and other evidence indicates strongly that disproportionate shares of the next generation of Americans are being reared in families with the least ability to provide their children with high social and economic opportunity.

A glaring example of the effects of limited social and economic opportunity in our urban areas is afforded by the large in-migration of Negroes. The in-migrant Negroes from the rural underprivileged areas of the South come ill prepared for life in urban centers. As one index of preparation for participation in life in the metropolis it may be noted that Negroes twenty-five and over in the rural South had an average (median) of 4.8 years of schooling in 1950. A major share of the present-day health and welfare problems of the Negro in our metropolitan areas must be attributed to their poor preparation for urban living. Health and welfare programs which deal with the Negro in disproportionate share represent but one part of the cost of the inadequate preparation for urban living of the Negro reared in the rural South. This perspective, incidentally, should make it clear that the provision of social and economic opportunity for the Negro is a national and not a regional or local problem.

Ecological and demographic analyses, then, conducted by the sociologist have demonstrated that group problems of "quality"—group differences in intelligence, abilities, preparation for urban living, good citizenship, occupational skill, delinquency or crime, or unemployment and poverty—are to be explained by differences in social and economic opportunity and not by race or ethnicity. This conclusion has, of course, the most profound significance for



56 health and welfare agencies; for it points up the function of these agencies as an institutional device to ameliorate the problems created by prior cultural and institutional failures in our society. In other words, adequate social and economic opportunity for the underprivileged groups would greatly decrease the case load of contemporary health and welfare agencies.

The materials here presented help to illuminate some of the historical and contemporary aspects of health and welfare problems and programs. They also provide a framework for peering into the future; for it is possible to project the trends which have been summarized and to consider some of their implications.

First, in respect to total population growth, the prospect for the future has been drastically altered by the postwar boom in marriages and births which was unanticipated either in magnitude or duration. Before the war, population projections indicated a maximum population of from 151 to 175 million persons in the United States with a stationary or declining population by the end of the century, assuming no immigrations. We have already, in 1956, surpassed a population of 165 million and may anticipate a total population of 207 to 228 million by 1975. This means an increase of from 55 to 75 million persons in the short span of twenty-five years between 1950 and 1975. The latter figure represents a population increase as large as the total population of the United States in 1900. All other things being equal, then—that is, assuming that health and welfare agencies retain about the same proportionate load—an increase of from 37 to 50 percent in load must be anticipated between 1950 and 1975 by reason of population increase alone.

The change in prospect for total population growth is the result of a sharp inflection point upward in the long-time downward trend in fertility. It is almost certain that the secular trend downward in completed fertilities—that is, the total number of children born to women above child-bearing age—has been reversed, and that for about a quarter of a century into the future family size will increase.<sup>18</sup> This, of course, calls for program adjustments in

<sup>18</sup> P. K. Whelpton, "Future Fertility of American Women," *Eugenics Quarterly*, I (1954), 4-17.



child health and welfare and family agencies which have been assuming decreasing family size.

Mortality may be expected to continue to decline with increasing gains for middle-aged and older persons as compared with the young, particularly as gains are registered in the battle against the degenerative diseases. Increases in expectation of life will, of course, continue to add to the burden of health and welfare agencies concerned with the adding of life to years to meet the increase in years added to life.

There will be a number of important changes in the composition of population as a result of the trends and differentials in fertility and mortality and the virtual cessation of immigration. In respect of ethnicity and race composition, two significant changes may be anticipated. By 1975 the proportion of foreign-born, 6.7 percent in 1950, will have shrunk to negligible proportions. The proportion of non-whites will be about the same—around 10 percent of the total—but the Negro will be much more evenly distributed between the South and the North and in much larger proportions both in Northern and Western metropolitan areas. By 1975 it is possible that the Negro will make up from one fourth to one third of a number of our larger cities and as much as one fifth of our larger metropolitan areas.

Great changes will also take place in the age structure of the United States. The increased birth rate will result in persons under 5 to 14 years of age increasing from 24.4 million to somewhere between 30.3 and 41.8 million, or from 24 to 71 percent. Persons 15 to 19 will increase from 10.7 million to between 17.3 and 20.3 million, or by 62 to 90 percent.<sup>14</sup>

These increases are among the most startling with which health and welfare agencies will be confronted. Among other things, they foreshadow an increase of 24 to 71 percent in services, including educational and recreational services, for youngsters 5 to 14 years of age. Moreover, it is to be noted that even if present delinquency rates remain the same, an increase of 62 to 90 percent may be anticipated in juvenile behavior problems and delinquency

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Revised Projections of the Population of the United States," *Current Population Reports: Population Estimates* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census), Series P-25, No. 123, pp. 1-10.

of persons 15 to 19 years of age through increased size of the population alone. Similar increases, of course, must be anticipated in respect of all health and welfare services for this age group.

At the other end of the age scale, persons 65 and over will increase by 66 percent while they grow from 14.1 to 20.7 millions. For the first time in the history of the United States the dependency ratio will increase. Persons under 20 or 65 and over will increase from 72 per 100 persons 20 to 64 in 1950, to a range of from 73 to 92 in 1975. The increase in older dependents will continue—from 14 to 18 per 100 persons of productive age; whereas the long-time decrease in younger dependents is likely to be reversed, changing from 58 per 100 persons of productive age in 1950 to from 55 to 74 by 1975. Thus, health and welfare agencies must manage to meet the requirements of a population that is both aging and "youthing" simultaneously.

The observed trends in labor force participation may be expected to continue. The labor force participation of men 14 years and older will decline somewhat between 1950 and 1975, whereas that for women will materially increase. Male labor force rates will go down from about 83 in 1950 to 81 in 1975, largely as a result of a decline among males under 20 and over 65. Males under 20 in the labor force will decline from a participation of 49 percent to 44 percent; the rate for men over 65 will decline from 45 to 37 percent. In contrast, women 14 and over will increase their participation rate from 31 percent to almost 38 percent. The gain will come from increased labor force participation of women 20 to 64 years of age; and especially among women 35 to 44 years of age, more than half of whom will be working by 1975.<sup>18</sup> Changes in the labor force participation of women, especially when coupled with the anticipated increase in completed families, portend increases in services for working mothers with children.

Trends in respect of the family cycle and family living arrangements, together with trends in expectation of life, indicate greater loads for agencies concerned with the survivors of marriages broken by death of a spouse. A disproportionate increase in the

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, "A Projected Growth of the Labor Force in the United States under Conditions of High Employment," *Current Population Reports: Labor Force* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Census, 1952), Series P-50, No. 42, pp. 1-8.

number of widows without children living at home may be anticipated; as well as increased pressure for suitable living accommodations and arrangements for widowers.

The trend toward urbanization of our population may be expected to continue with ever increasing concentration of population in our great metropolitan centers. By 1975 it is possible that three fourths of our population may be urban. Within our urban communities important changes may be anticipated in respect both of physical plant and of human problems.

It is reasonable to expect that by 1975 most of our present-day slums will have disappeared. That is, present efforts toward "urban renewal," including slum clearance, conservation, and rehabilitation, which are likely to be intensified, may well rid our urban centers of the vestiges of the nineteenth-century fabulous growth which provided us with a heritage of fabulous twentieth-century slums. Concerted efforts to rebuild the decayed centers of our cities are almost certain to alter the appearance of urban America.

On the other hand, this does not mean that the prospect is entirely an optimistic one. At least two dark clouds are to be observed. One concerns the rate of obsolescence of residential plant in our present outlying areas within cities and in the suburbs. The relatively rapid growth which these areas have experienced during this century could mean that slums will infest the peripheries of our cities and suburbia by the time we have reconstructed our urban inner zones. It is possible that we may simply turn our cities inside out in respect to slum characteristics. This is almost certain to happen if the peripheral areas do not heed the experience of the inner zones.

Second, present relationships between income and housing costs do not permit low-income families in cities to occupy urban housing except under conditions of intensive occupancy, which means slum occupancy. It is possible that we shall breed new slums as fast as we clear out the old ones until either private industry can produce houses in which low-income families can afford to live with decent standards, or until the United States is prepared greatly to increase the volume of subsidized (public) housing for low-income families.

By 1975 some of the more difficult problems which have plagued health and welfare agencies will have virtually disappeared. With the decrease of the immigrant population to negligible proportions the many frictions and problems of the accommodation and assimilation of the foreign-born will have largely passed into history. By 1975 the first and second generation of Negro in-migrants to Northern urban centers and the first generation of Negro in-migrants to the West should be well on the road to adjustment. Their accommodation to city life will be measurable in the extent to which they will have moved away from the slums and by their advances in health and longevity and in educational and occupational levels. These Negroes by then will have demonstrated, as have the successive waves of European immigrants, that given adequate opportunity the members of any race as well as any ethnic group can participate in the American way of life in conformity with American standards.

Yet, with the continued in-migration of Negroes to Northern and Western cities it must be anticipated that for at least several decades the population group that will be most beset with problems which require the attention of health and welfare agencies will be the Negro (and, on a smaller scale, the Puerto Ricans<sup>16</sup> and the Mexicans). Moreover, the usual run of problems associated with in-migrant groups at the bottom of the economic and social ladder will be augmented by those arising from prevalent attitudes toward race differences and the exceedingly poor preparation which Southern rural Negroes have received for urban living.

Social work agencies must plan and organize their programs and facilities in full recognition of the magnitude and complex character of this situation. Fortunately, the problems associated with the accommodation and assimilation of the Negro will be greatly diminished and much easier to deal with if our present high levels of economic activity continue. By the same token, however, a sharp recession or another depression could bring about untold misery both for the Negroes in our metropolitan areas and for the communities in which they reside.

The studies of the demographer and the ecologist are among the

<sup>16</sup> Puerto Rican in-migration has up to this point achieved large scale only in New York City. Chicago is beginning to receive appreciable numbers, and other cities may experience Puerto Rican in-migration in the future.

contributions of sociological research which help to illuminate the problems of social work. Analyses of the population trends and of patterns in metropolitan ecological structure and process help to explain many aspects of both the historical and the contemporary social problems which call for the attention of social workers. Moreover, such analyses also permit projections of population and ecological trends into the future and thus enable social work agencies to anticipate changes in the magnitude and nature of their case loads and to plan accordingly.

In broad perspective, health and welfare agencies are social inventions designed to deal with the social problems resulting from man's transformation of his traditional way of life. In the United States the social problems with which social agencies are confronted are those which in large measure are the result of fantastically rapid total population growth, fabulous rates of urbanization, tremendous admixtures of ethnic and racial groups, and gigantic cycles of physical construction, obsolescence, and decay. (The Hollywood adjectives are used advisedly, for the advent of the United States is indeed a most remarkable and unprecedented chapter in the annals of human history.)

The United States through its rich combination of human and physical resources and its unique mixing of freedom and control in the social, economic, and political spheres has produced the highest mass level of living ever achieved. It has participated in the creation of the most advanced technology; built an amazing physical plant in its urban and metropolitan complexes; and has participated also in the great development of the arts and the sciences. Yet these triumphs, symbolizing the achievements of Western civilization, have not been gained without cost. There have been many costs. Among these costs have been the social problems, community, family, and personal, which confront the social worker.

The development of health and welfare agencies to deal with some aspects of the human costs of technological and cultural change is relatively recent. Social agencies and programs are still emergent just as social and human problems are still emergent in a civilization which continues to change rapidly.

In closing, it is in order briefly to review the effects of some of

the changes which have been considered on the organization and financing of health and welfare agencies. The agencies, whether public or volunteer, have been organized and financed almost entirely within the framework of the urban political units in which they originated. Our metropolitan centers, however, have long since outgrown their political boundaries. The economic, geographic, and demographic entities which constitute our metropolitan areas by far transcend their inherited local governmental units, and their problems, physical and social, often defy segmental approach by individual local governmental units. Similarly, the health and welfare problems of our metropolitan complexes in most communities defy the efforts of the loose, decentralized, and fragmented volunteer agencies to deal efficiently and effectively with them.

57 The health and welfare problems of our metropolitan areas are in an increasing measure unitary problems necessitating a unified approach. Dozens of community funds or chests and hundreds of volunteer agencies within a single metropolitan area hardly represent effective administrative organization for dealing with or anticipating the rapid change in the magnitude and character of social work loads, for planning long-range programs, for continuity in financing health and welfare activities, or for administering the volunteer health and welfare dollar to the best advantage. The same demographic and ecological changes which have drastically increased the size and complexity of social problems have also outmoded the traditional forms of volunteer agency organization and financing.

This is not to imply that our metropolitan areas necessarily must strain toward a single super health and welfare agency any more than the multiplicity of our metropolitan governments must strive for a single supermetropolitan government. But it does mean more effective organization in most metropolitan areas for viewing health and welfare problems as unitary problems affecting the entire area. It does mean more effective planning of services on a long-run basis. It does mean more rational financing and budget-making. In brief, what may be called for is a realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the organization of volunteer

agencies to deal with the changed and changing character of their job; and a reorganization of administrative arrangements to permit operation on a planned, effective, and efficient basis instead of the all too often hit-and-miss, emergency, year-to-year basis which in many places still prevails.

With the continued development of social work as a social engineering profession the process of developing social work techniques and programs has become more efficient and effective. Social work, like other professions, is continuously striving to advance its knowledge, to sharpen its techniques, and to improve its services. In this effort social work is not only building its own fund of knowledge but drawing more and more from the various sciences that can help to define and to illuminate its problems. Sociology is among the sciences which produce research of utility to social work. It is to be hoped that this discussion of some of the results and implications of demographic and ecological research has helped to illustrate the way in which sociologists can be useful to social workers and suggested ways of more useful collaboration in the years which lie ahead.



THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRIALIZATION ON  
FAMILY LIFE <sup>1</sup>

by HAROLD L. WILENSKY

POPULAR DISCUSSION STILL REVEALS two dominant views as to what is happening to the American family. Family expert Carle C. Zimmerman,<sup>2</sup> a proponent of one view, says the family is dissolving. Divorce is on the increase; more wives are working and therefore spend less time with the family; the marriage contract is becoming less sacred and more secular; parents are losing authority over children (a fact seen in the "revolt of youth"). Above all, an "unbridled individualism" and a decline in the spirit of self-sacrifice have led to a decline in the birth rate; women are now less willing to bear the large broods of children who form the basis of familism. The decay of the family, our most important primary group, heralds the further decay of civilization itself.

The second view—early stated by another family expert, Joseph K. Folsom<sup>3</sup>—holds that the family is simply changing its organization and will emerge strengthened, better adapted to a democratic society. The double standard is declining; choice of mate is more voluntary, a matter for self-determination; mechanization of the smaller home, plus a flood of goods and services, has reduced the drudgery of housework; males are less dominant, wives have more equality in law and in daily living. Above all,

<sup>1</sup> Based in part on material from Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, *Industrialization and Social Welfare* (to be published by the Russell Sage Foundation), an analysis of the impact of industrialization on the supply and organization of social welfare services in the United States. I wish to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of Ronald Freedman and David G. French.

<sup>2</sup> Carle C. Zimmerman, *Family and Civilization* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947).

<sup>3</sup> Joseph K. Folsom, *The Family and Democratic Society* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1943).

there is the partial shift of traditional family functions—protective, educational, economic—to the state, school, and industry. This makes family members more independent of one another. It thereby strengthens the family as an adaptable emotional unit. Love, freed from economic compulsion and parental authority, may become more loyal and permanent. Companionship and satisfying affection in the family will create men who are less inclined to sabotage democracy in the community.

Both proponents are correct in their facts; they are merely reading out of different hymnbooks—their interpretations stem from different value premises.

My task here is to link these facts to some major changes in our society, changes which America experiences in common with other nations undergoing industrialization and urbanization. I shall assume throughout that the smaller drama in which we are all intimately involved, the daily drama of family living, is a reflection of the larger and less intimate drama of unfolding industrialism. I assume, further, that predictions of what family life will be like ten or twenty years from now must rest on predictions of what an advanced industrial society will demand from its members in the way of obligations and offer in the way of opportunities. The things I shall talk about are not glamorous, but they are momentous: changes in occupational structure, in patterns of social and residential mobility, and in the location of industry and population.

A student of industrialization suggests that "modern industry and the 'traditional' family are mutually subversive." Commercial agriculture and the factory system everywhere, if they are to develop, must force the breakup of the economically self-sufficient extended family.<sup>4</sup> What has happened to the American family since the Civil War is just one example of this. A good way to get at this process is to contrast kinship systems of nonindustrial societies with the family system prevailing in the American urban

<sup>4</sup> Marion J. Levy, Jr., *The Family Revolution in Modern China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 354; Marion J. Levy, Jr., and Shih Kuo-Heng, *The Rise of the Modern Chinese Business Class* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1949), pp. 11-14.

middle class. I choose the urban middle-class family because it most closely fits the needs of modern industry and it is also becoming more important as the model for the rest of the population.

Our family system, well known to social workers, may be quickly reviewed:<sup>5</sup>

1. "Family," for midcentury America, generally means the nuclear (or "conjugal") family of parents and nonadult children living at home. Other kinsmen are all "relatives," who are considered far less important.

2. The marriage bond is the key; one's first kinship loyalty is unequivocally to spouse and children. Both the interests and the place of residence of this nuclear family tend to be independent of both pairs of parents. The many extended kin groups so prevalent among nonindustrial peoples have practically disappeared. The nuclear family acts together on matters economic, social, and (if we can take studies of voting behavior as a clue), political. It is a close-knit unit.

3. Choice of mate is relatively free. In contrast to customs prevalent in nonindustrial societies, casual dating and competitive courtship are the rule, and personal choice is emphasized. The choice of mate is no major threat either to the parental family or to the relatives. They will not have to live with the newly married couple; generally, they will neither support them nor depend upon them. In fact, they may not even see them very often. No great harm is done, then, if personal feelings are given free play. Compared to the primitive tribe or peasant village, the

<sup>5</sup> The structural analysis offered here is indebted to: Kingsley Davis, "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict," *American Sociological Review*, V (1940), 523-35, and "Jealousy and Sexual Property," *Social Forces*, XIV (1936), 395-405; Kingsley Davis, H. C. Bredemeier, and Marion J. Levy, Jr., eds., *Modern American Society* (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1949); Talcott Parsons, *Essays in Sociological Theory, Pure and Applied* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949), pp. 233-50; Levy, *op. cit.*; Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, *The Changing American Parent: a Study in the Detroit Area* (New York: John Wiley, 1957); Willard Waller, *The Family: a Dynamic Interpretation* (rev. ed.; New York: Dryden Press, 1952). The picture of the American kinship system given below is desperately oversimplified. For instance, it leaves out many variations that exist among ethnic groups, social strata, and regions. When I say "nonindustrial" I mean "so much less industrialized than the United States that traditional agricultural patterns of life remain dominant."

courting couple is thus drastically emancipated from ties to parents, siblings, and "relatives." And because economic pressures and kinship pressures to stay married are not so strong, there is an expectation that love will hold; if it does not, the parties may be thought "maladjusted" or "immature." Marriage is idealized as a total intimacy. The belief is strong that romance should play a part in courtship and people should marry for love.

4. Despite the current baby boom, small families are still the fashion. Studies in the Detroit area suggest the emergence of overwhelming consensus among all strata of the urban population that families with two, three, or four children are "ideal"; and the achievement continues to be lower than the ideal. We seem to have moved to a two- or three-child system.<sup>6</sup>

5. The accent on the nuclear family may increase emotional intensity among its members. There is little evidence for this, but the argument seems plausible: if family size is smaller, if "relatives" become more distant, if the husband's and wife's contacts outside the family are "functionally specific" (more businesslike), and the child's relations in school and play group more competitive, then the family becomes the main source of psychological security; and the emotional ties among its members are heightened.

In short, production has been removed from the home, extended kin sheared away, family size reduced, and at the same time a great deal of family sentiment has probably been fostered and directed toward the few persons left.

Modern industry demands a large, mobile, and motivated labor supply. It is here we find a clue to the main features of the American kinship system. Our great emphasis on the nuclear family is made necessary by industrialization, especially by the occupational and residential mobility it necessitates.

In March of each of the last five years, almost one in five of all people in the labor force lived in houses different from their residences twelve months earlier; about one in twenty labor

<sup>6</sup> Ronald Freedman, David Goldberg, and Harry Sharp, "Ideals about Family Size in the Detroit Metropolitan Area: 1954," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, XXXIII (1955), 187-97.

force members lived in a different county. If conditions for this time of high-level employment are typical, then the average worker under present conditions may be expected to change his residence about eight times in his working life; two or three of these would involve a change of community. Apparently we change our houses almost as often as we change our cars.

Most of this migration is in response to changing economic opportunity. Job changes also go with changes in family size. About the time the young couple needs more room because of children, they need more money too and they hunt both for better jobs and for better housing. Most of such shifts occur in the first ten years after a family is founded.<sup>7</sup> Note, too, that "migration is generally more frequent among the better educated, higher income, professional members of a society than among workers of the same age but lower in the socioeconomic scale."<sup>8</sup> In other words, geographical mobility is very high for the whole population, but it is highest among those who conform most to the kinship pattern dominant in the urban middle class.

43 The connection between such mobility and the accent on the nuclear family is easy to see. If, on the average, one moves every few years one cannot bring along ten or twenty in-laws, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, cousins, and so forth, especially if they too are moving about at a great rate. And if one is oriented toward "success," and success is had by investing one's money and energy so they are readily available for transfer to more profitable commitments, by job shifts within and between careers, then one thinks twice before undertaking lasting obligations—financial, emotional, or otherwise—to extended kin of varied social status. A man who moves up in the world from a traditional Chinese family buys his *father* a house that fits his new position: the whole clan comes along. A man who moves up in the world from a poor American home would surely buy *himself* the house; he might

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Peter H. Rossi, *Why Families Move; a Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), p. 9. Charles A. Myers, "Patterns of Labor Mobility," in William Haber *et al.*, eds., *Manpower in the United States* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), pp. 154-65.

<sup>8</sup> Donald J. Bogue, "Residential Mobility and Migration of Workers," in Haber, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

visit his father once a year or so, or even have him placed in a home for the aged. Industrialization (largely through moving people about geographically and socially) has emancipated the married couple.

Such mobility and the emancipation that it brings can, of course, be disruptive. The emancipation of youth, of women, of the aged, as we all know, has involved difficult adjustments. A brief comment about two of the social problems that have emerged—the aged and divorce—will illustrate.

Of all the social problems created by the impact of industrialism on the family, none is more certain to increase in importance than the problem of the aged.

In a nonindustrial society, increased age typically brings increased power, prestige, and security. It is the oldest members of the clan who are treated with most respect and have most authority. Parenthood is a kind of old-age insurance.

The nuclear family of industrial society, as we have seen, changes all this. Here, children have the duty to build their own careers, and set up their own households, with a corresponding right to independence. They leave home one by one until the older couple is finally left alone, with "no one left to respect them, for them to have responsibility for or have authority over."<sup>9</sup> At this point, all the things that happen to old people become very much more tragic. If the spouse should die, the widow or widower is not generally expected to move in with the married child. If he does, it occasions much strain on both sides. Another feature of industrialism, accelerating technological change, means a continual rescrambling of jobs; existing skills are diluted or made obsolete. It is the older, more skilled worker who is hit hardest. Even in years of prosperity, a man who has invested his time, his money, his very self, in his work is reluctant to accept downgrading or launch on new occupational ventures. If this older worker is displaced, or if he is retired, he has no clear claim to support from his children. Should he be subject to disabling illness or debilitation, the same emancipation from his children

<sup>9</sup> Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

becomes an even more difficult load to bear. In this system, parenthood in retrospect becomes for many not old-age insurance, but a sacrificial duty, a thankless task.

Millions of Americans are not many years off the land—rural people accustomed to a comfortably extended kinship system. In fact, about one in three of our nonfarm residents grew up on farms.<sup>10</sup> The generations are thus bound to clash; and the dismay of the old who hold to the old ways, the guilty consciences of the young who are moving to the new, are painful evidence of the clash.

At the same time that the industrial emphasis on the nuclear family leaves the aged parents stranded, their numbers increase. Everywhere the advance of industrialism increases the chance of dying from old age instead of from epidemic disease or malnutrition. This picture holds, in so far as the data are comparable, for the entire world: the more industrialization, the more longevity.

The fact that so much of America's welfare expenditure goes to the aged must be seen, then, as the by-product of an increased emphasis on the nuclear family, the rapidity of social change, and the aging of population. These, in turn, are the inevitable results of industrialization.

A family can be broken in many ways: by divorce, desertion, annulment, informal separation, premature death of one spouse. Except for the latter, all these types of family disruption have probably been on the increase. There are no official statistics on desertion and separation. The evidence is better on divorce, and the studies unanimously show an almost uninterrupted increase in the divorce rate for the period known. The peak was reached in 1946, when there was just over one divorce for each four marriages made that same year. The peak reflects both the typical breakup of hasty and ill-advised wartime marriages and the wartime backlog of delayed divorces.<sup>11</sup> There has been a slight decline since; but it is my guess that the long-term trend of divorce will

<sup>10</sup> Ronald Freedman and Deborah Freedman, "Farm-reared Elements in the Non-farm Population," *Rural Sociology* (1956, forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> Robert O. Blood, Jr., *Anticipating Your Marriage* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), p. 278, chart.



not be sharply downward and that divorce will remain far more frequent than it was before America's industrialization.

These trends in divorce rates are very similar in all Western nations permitting divorce.<sup>12</sup> They accord with our picture of kinship in industrial society. With extended kin sliced away, with deep, lifelong friendships outside the family thwarted by great mobility, a heavy load is put upon the small nuclear family. Feelings of guilt about aid to aging parents add to the load.

Industrialism provides another source of strain on the immediate family. Everywhere the rise of industry is accompanied by agitation for the emancipation of women both within the family and within society—often taking the form of feminist movements. With the varied and complex jobs it provides, an industrial society tends to challenge traditional criteria of work assignment like sex and race. It accents ability to perform. Advancing industrialization puts more women in the labor force; it also gives the edge to married women. At midcentury, the number of married women at work exceeds for the first time the number of single women at work, a trend that seems to be continuing. Women work to supplement family income (an aspect of rising levels of aspiration for self and children); to support their families (a necessity because of the increased number of families broken due to separation, divorce, and desertion); to achieve "self-fulfillment" (a reflection of the changing definition of woman's role); and because the opportunities have increased (due to the shift toward work assignment on the basis of "what you can do or learn to do" and the fact that women can do an increasing portion of the jobs available).

More women, especially married women, work; and more and more of them come to believe they should have "a life of their own." At the same time, it is thought that their work should not put them in competition with their husbands; that their careers, if they have careers, should be subordinate to their husbands'; that the demands of a job are in conflict with the demands of the home in an era of "scientific" child-rearing. One of the strains

<sup>12</sup> William Fielding Ogburn and Meyer E. Nimkoff, *Technology and the Changing Family* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955), p. 219.

imposed on the newly emancipated nuclear family, then, is the conflict between a rising insistence on equality with men in competitive occupational achievement, on the one hand, and the continued blocks to equal competition and the new demands for expertness in home and family management, on the other. Women have become disaffected from traditional marital and family roles without getting released from housewifery; they have achieved new privileges, more equal with men's, but are uncertain of what contribution they ought to make to the new partnership. Here again, the old patterns and the new exist side by side: a husband may assist his wife in washing dishes and dressing kids to conform to the new norms of equality but resent it when he sees his neighbor getting away with less.

The load on the nuclear family is increased, relations with aging parents get difficult, and the wife's role becomes ambiguous. At the same time, the economic and kinship pressures to stay married become weaker. The increased divorce rate and the shift in popular attitude from severe disapproval to mild disapproval of divorce are reflections of the basic changes in the kinship system, changes that come with rapid industrialization.

Now divorce is not new. It is not peculiar to our time or our society. Among both modern nations and primitive tribes may be found divorce rates that are probably higher than ours (e.g., both in modern Egypt and among the Hopi Indians of North America). But in these societies divorce is not a social problem; in ours, it is. The explanation lies in the different consequences for the children where the kinship system rests on the immediate family rather than on wider kin groups, which can act as shock absorbers.

Among the Hopi,<sup>13</sup> the married couple lives with the wife's parents and her sisters and their husbands. The core of the clan is a close-knit group of females. Married men, though they live in their wives' households, look upon the households of their mothers or sisters as their real homes.

<sup>13</sup> Laura Thompson and Alice Joseph, *The Hopi Way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), pp. 34 ff.; Stuart A. Queen and John B. Adams, *The Family in Various Cultures* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1952), pp. 23-43.

Hopi divorce has little significance either to the participants or to their society. If a wife does not bother to thank her husband for the grain he brings home one day (a sign she is "fed up" with him), the man simply packs up his personal effects and tools and moves back to his real home (his mother's or sisters'). Generally, the economic adjustments are minor, for there are enough men (unmarried sons or daughters' husbands) left in the family to continue farming as before. Little emotional shock attends the break because husband-wife intimacy is only slightly greater than that among all the adults in the household. The children, bound to their mother's kin, also remain much as before, with many substitute "parents" available; in such a system children sometimes do not even know the names of their fathers. The high Hopi divorce rate, like that in many primitive societies, is no social problem.

I need not compare the situation in our own society with its heavy emphasis on the immediate family. Those who deal with consequences of marital discord and divorce know better than I how the child can become the target for consolation, revenge, or whatnot. You have seen parents compete for his custody, though not for his support. You know too how vague the principles are by which the court disposes of the child. The child of divorce, as Davis suggests, is a social problem in the sense that the societal machinery for dealing with him seldom operates smoothly; too much attention goes to pinning the blame on someone.<sup>14</sup>

In the initial stages of industrialization everywhere millions of people are uprooted from traditional rural areas and ways of life to begin the painful transition from farm to factory, country to city, and, in America, from alien immigrant to citizen. The vast amount of mobility necessary in the new industrial setting makes an emphasis on the nuclear family inevitable. This, together with other developments, places a strain upon the relations of husband and wife, aging parents, and growing children. Family breakup increases.

But open the package of industrialism wide and the picture changes. Many students believe that continuing industrialization

<sup>14</sup> Davis, Bredemeier, and Levy, *op. cit.*, pp. 673, 686.

and the newer suburbanization that goes with it will in time bring greater stability to family life and may even lower the divorce rate.

For perhaps the first time in the history of the world a large portion of the people who must work in big cities now have a choice: they can live in a dense urban settlement; or they can move to the less crowded metropolitan "ring"—to a satellite city, a suburban or even a rural fringe—and commute. They seem to be choosing the fringe over the center. The population of metropolitan rings grew almost three times as fast as central cities from 1930 to 1950.<sup>15</sup> Within the ring, the unincorporated rural territory has grown faster than the rest.<sup>16</sup> The central city has practically exploded and scattered itself over the countryside.

The suburbs are by no means uniform either in physical appearance or in way of life. They include small residential communities as well as thin ribbons of houses and farms along major highways. Part of suburban growth has been orderly and planned and has resulted in garden cities with adequate educational and welfare facilities. Part of the growth has resulted in "suburban sprawl," with shanty towns, mud-rut streets in partially developed subdivisions, suburban homes mixed up with suburban factories and stores, and the like. As Bogue suggests, no one yet knows whether the proportion of the suburban population living under "good" conditions is larger or smaller than that in our central cities, whether we define "good" in terms of services and physical living conditions (adequate housing, schools, libraries, churches, streets, water and sewage systems) or in terms of low indices of "disorganization" (crime, delinquency, mental disease).

In speaking of suburbanism as a way of life, another caution is in order. On the one hand we have a picture of the "outgoing life" in "mass-produced suburbs" like Park Forest, Illinois, or the Levittowns. Journalists William H. Whyte, Jr.,<sup>17</sup> and Harry

<sup>15</sup> Donald J. Bogue, *Population Growth in Standard Metropolitan Areas, 1900-1950* (Washington, D.C.: Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, Division of Housing Research, 1953).

<sup>16</sup> Donald J. Bogue, ed., *Needed Urban and Metropolitan Research* (Oxford, Ohio: Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems, Miami University, 1953).

<sup>17</sup> William H. Whyte, "The Outgoing Life," *Fortune*, XLVIII (1953), 84-88, 156-60.

Henderson<sup>18</sup> have described young, middle-class, college-educated suburbanites "on the make," transients who expect quickly to move on and up but who meanwhile engage in almost frantic participation in neighborhood and community affairs. They participate partly because their ages, incomes, and occupations are so alike that social activity becomes the basis of prestige; and partly because the kids get organized and then organize their parents. Some recent sociological studies seem to confirm this picture. On the other hand, there are industrial cities like Flint, Michigan, whose factory-dotted suburban area contains proportionately *more* manual workers than the city. In this area, one in four home owners built his house with his own hands—a time-consuming enterprise which may be one reason why *fewer* Flint suburbanites join formal organizations, including churches, than city residents.<sup>19</sup> Here, life is not so "outgoing."

Variations, yes. But the evidence does seem to suggest the possibility that the suburbs are setting a pattern for a newer family form that will embrace both Flint and Levittown. The suburban family, compared to the central city family, tends to be somewhat larger. It attaches more positive value to children and becomes more important in the daily routine of its members. The parents not only try to take their child-rearing cues from medicine and psychology, they may also try to supervise the education and recreation as well as the courtship of their children more closely than is possible in the central city.<sup>20</sup> The suburban family also seems to approve more than the city family of employment for mothers, especially when the children reach adolescence.<sup>21</sup> The suburb may be the place where women are finding new identity and resolving their conflicts. These tendencies can contribute to

<sup>18</sup> Harry Henderson, "The Mass-produced Suburbs" (Part I: How People Live in America's Newest Towns), *Harper's Magazine*, CCVII (1953), 25 ff.

<sup>19</sup> Flint City—Fringe Survey, Social Science Research Project, University of Michigan, 1955.

<sup>20</sup> Frederick Elkin and William A. Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," *American Sociological Review*, XX (1955), 680-84.

<sup>21</sup> E. Gartley Jaco and Ivan Belknap, "Is a New Family Form Emerging on the Urban Fringe?" *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (1953), 551, 562; Sylvia Fleis Fava, "Suburbanism as a Way of Life," *American Sociological Review*, XXI (1956), 34-37.

family solidarity. The blue-collar and white-collar workers who "live out and work in" may thus get the chance to increase their family stability at the same time that they increase their job mobility. The suburban home becomes the more-or-less permanent base; the central city and its ring become an economic hunting ground—with job moves tied less closely to house moves.<sup>22</sup>

Suburbanization aside, there are reasons to believe that mature industrialization will in itself bring new patterns of family life, and perhaps reverse the long-term trend toward family instability. The new technology of automation and the atom will accentuate two general tendencies in our social structure:

1. The growth of the "new middle class," a mass of salaried white-collar and professional people. An ever smaller proportion of the labor force is needed for direct production, more for service, especially jobs requiring brainwork and/or customer or client contact.

2. A merging of the upper blue-collar worker with the new middle class. He has already merged in income and possessions. For the first time in this century more Americans own their own homes than rent; the middle-class package (the car, the electric stove, the refrigerator, the washing machine, the deep freeze) is becoming widely distributed; leisure has come to all.<sup>23</sup> With automation, the merging may become more complete: blue-collar work is becoming more mental and less physical, more a matter of alertness and sense of responsibility and less a matter of manual dexterity.

Thus the typical urban industrial man, white collar or blue collar, suburbanite or not, finds himself increasingly in big organizations, doing a job requiring more skill and/or education. He

<sup>22</sup> Kate K. Liepman, *The Journey to Work* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944).

<sup>23</sup> But the whole structure is sustained by a heavy bet on the future, with long-term mortgages for the home, the installment plan for the package. As for leisure, in millions of homes it takes two jobs and often many overtime hours (for which workers are generally eager) to put the family in the middle bracket. Under these circumstances the achievement in income quality is precarious, for even a mild recession can quickly reverse the trend as the overtime hours and then one or two of the family jobs disappear. Also, for a small portion of the population—high-status professionals, executives, and politicians—"leisure" so merges with "work" that there may be no more time spent in aimless play than there was a century ago.



gets paid more for fewer hours. The large bureaucratic organization, which tends to be more stable and have longer lines of promotion, offers him a regularized career. A vast variety of government and private welfare programs greatly increases his security. I dwell on these developments on the work front because there is good reason to believe that the way a man gets his living will affect the way he rears his children and spends his leisure time.<sup>24</sup>

Despite the fact that the journey to and from work may be longer, it is a fast journey, and our typical urban-industrial man has more time for the family. His more ordered striving means less necessity for the worry and risks of a free-enterprising existence—in contrast to his father, who was a farmer, a small businessman, or an independent professional. No longer is he a “yokel,” facing disruption of his life routine with each change of house or job. Increasing proportions of the population have lived in cities before and are accustomed to mobility as a “built-in” feature of their personal and social organization.

With striking consistency the recent studies of urban life underscore the nuclear family as the basic area of involvement for all types of urban populations. We find not a madly mobile, rootless mass, disintegrating for want of intimate ties, but an almost bucolic contentment with the narrow circle of kin and close friends, with the typical urbanite spending most of his leisure with the family at home, caring for the children, watching tele-

<sup>24</sup> A careful study of Detroit mothers (Miller and Swanson, *op. cit.*) illustrates how differences in work environment can be reflected in such matters as child-rearing philosophies and practices. They found sharp contrasts between the child training of families whose heads work in large bureaucratic organizations and those whose heads were more free enterprising or less used to urban living (e.g., self-employed, born on a farm or abroad, etc.). The parents who had had the most experience in “non-entrepreneurial roles in welfare-bureaucratic settings” (wage workers or salaried employees in big hierarchical organizations who do not take entrepreneurial risks) put less accent in their child training on an active, independent approach to the world; they were also less concerned with “internalization,” with development of strong “built-in” self-control, with what David Reisman calls “inner direction” (*The Lonely Crowd* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950]). Middle-class “bureaucratic” parents encourage an accommodating, adjustive way of life. “The child’s peers become colleagues whose favor he must court and whose respect he must win.” He must learn to be a “‘nice guy’—affable, unthreatening, responsible, competitive, adaptive.” The world of work increasingly demands the human relations skills needed to find one’s way around the big organizations; the family reflects this in its child training.



vision, working in the garden, reading. Occasionally he makes forays into the world outside, mainly to visit relatives, sometimes to demonstrate his lightly held attachment to a formal organization or two.<sup>25</sup> When he moves, it is all part of the life plan, of the career.

As industrialization pushes us toward the four-day week, as work becomes more ordered and secure and income more regular, home and leisure are going to be even more than they are now man's central life interest.

This "typical" picture may seem idealized, and it is true that it applies more to the growing new middle class than to the rest of the population. But this model of family life is diffusing through American culture. Two great new "melting pots" will speed the diffusion: (1) the middle-class suburb where the up-mobile blue-collar worker learns to behave more like his white-collar colleague; (2) the large bureaucratic organization—factory, office, hospital, or store—where all come to value and practice the regularized life.

There are long-run implications for family-serving agencies:

1. *New clientele.*—Though social work is seen less and less as an emergency service for the destitute, it is still true that most of its clientele comes from underprivileged people.<sup>26</sup> With the decline of poverty and the emergence of a massive middle class, the trend toward more diversified clientele on a fee-for-service basis will speed up.

2. *Broader goals for family counseling.*—With broader clientele and more acceptance of social work as a regular professional service there will be more chance to move beyond emergency adjustment as the goal of family counseling. As Foote and Cottrell suggest, there can be more planning for optimal development of the

<sup>25</sup> Joel Smith, William H. Form, and Gregory P. Stone, "Local Intimacy in a Middle-sized City," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX (1954), 276-84; Morris Axelrod, "Urban Fringe?" *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (1953), 551, 562; Sylvia Fleis (1956), 13-18; Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: a Study of 'the Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," *Social Problems*, III (1956), 131-42.

<sup>26</sup> A study made in St. Paul showed that in November, 1948, only 6 percent of the city's families used over half the services of the city's health, dependency, and adjustment agencies. See Bradley Buell *et al.*, *Community Planning for Human Services* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 9.

client, more receptivity to the idea of organizing clients to plan for their own development so they can meet future problems on their own.<sup>27</sup>

As work fades into the background and leisure is pursued for its own sake, new possibilities for family strain and conflict develop. Think of a woman who increasingly feels she should be part of her blue-collar husband's leisure activities. Then think of her husband, who once could get away from it all by retreating into an all-male world (the tavern, the ball game, the fishing trip). Today, even if his wife does not pressure him for joint participation in new and different leisure routines, he finds these last strongholds of maleness contaminated by the presence of women. Even the factory is decreasingly an all-male sanctuary.

As man becomes more the consumer and less the producer, he needs help here, too. William Whyte<sup>28</sup> describes some eighty-three young suburban couples in the \$5,000-\$7,500 bracket whose management of money would shock their counterparts a generation ago. Obsessed with a desire for regularity in money transactions, they prefer the high-interest installment plan to the free charge account, they show colossal indifference to, and ignorance of, 12 and 18 percent interest rates on loans at the bank, or "revolving credit plans" at the department store. Family counseling? They need some simple induction into middle-class home management, now apparently supplied by no one.

Family-serving agencies of the not-so-distant future can make a major contribution by thinking through such problems as the creative use of leisure and the rational use of money; we shall all be having plenty of both.

3. *Boom towns and ghost towns.*—One possible outcome of the spread of automation when coupled with, eventually, cheap atomic power is the more frequent occurrence of the boom town-ghost town cycle. The new technology, including new sources of power, may make industry more mobile. A plant or a whole industry now

<sup>27</sup> Nelson N. Foote and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., *Identity and Interpersonal Competence: New Directions in Family Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 130.

<sup>28</sup> William H. Whyte, Jr., "Budgetism: Opiate of the Middle Class," *Fortune*, LIII (May, 1956), 133-72.

8 tied to a location close to coal or some other relatively fixed source of power may soon be set down anywhere it can get labor and raw materials. "Factories in the cornfield," whether fifty miles from a downtown business district of a huge metropolitan area or further out, are already part of the swing toward suburbanization of population and industry. When demand for products changes, when these factories become obsolete, some of them will move—and leave their labor stranded in the cornfield.

When these brand-new industrial towns are booming, social workers can do much to dramatize and meet the need for adequate welfare services; when these towns are becoming ghost towns, social workers can continue their expert testimony on the need for broadened income maintenance programs, for job information, and for moving allowances to smooth the shift of families out of depressed areas into a new life elsewhere.

4. *Fashioning the new suburbia for family living: big decisions and small.*—Many of the changes affecting families must be met by community organization and planning efforts. In shaping the new suburbia, all of us, professional practitioners and ordinary citizens alike, need to think a bit more in utopian terms. The British, for instance, have been debating about the "life-cycle community" for some time, and Whyte tells us that some American realtors see its commercial possibilities. You enter the community, let us say, at the age of twenty-six with wife and baby and a two-bedroom court apartment. Three years later, when the income is up and baby number three is on the way, you buy a low-priced three-bedroom ranch house not far away. This lasts maybe five years, and then you and your upmoving friends one by one launch into more expensive split-level jobs. Fifteen years later, when the children have married and moved away, you sell the house and go back to the two-bedroom court where you started (it was built to last). The young couples just beginning the journey are delighted to have you and your wife around as baby sitters and substitute grandparents.

Other less cosmic plans emerge from day-to-day decisions we all make about our homes and families. I think now about a decision we and our neighbors are drifting into. I live in one of these

"sapling subdivisions" loaded with young children, twenty of them within seven adjacent houses. Well, do we put up hedges between our properties or do we leave clear space on the cross-cutting downslope in our back yards which the kids use for sledding in the winter? A small thing, but answers to it and to hundreds of other small problems will doubtless have major cumulative impact on the quality of family life.

To help people become aware of their values and alternatives in small decisions like this, and in major decisions like housing choice; to help them seek development on their own—these tasks offer large opportunity for our family-serving agencies. (50)

A new clientele, preoccupied with leisure and consumption, permitting broader goals for family counseling; plus continuing problems of community planning and economic instability—these are some of the implications for family-serving agencies of the newer, richer, more challenging age of the atom and automation.

## SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE GROUP

by MUZAFER SHERIF

IN MODERN DIFFERENTIATED SOCIETIES with complex division of labor, problems of social responsibility assert themselves as mutual interdependence of men and groups becomes increasingly compelling. They are enormous problems, encompassing on the one hand the area of social control and, on the other, the development of "social conscience." The many facets of social responsibility include psychiatric, psychological, sociological, cultural, political, economic, and industrial issues. Collaboration and coordination of various disciplines are required to meet its challenge. 43

Therefore, it would be pretentious for a representative of any one of these disciplines to discuss the entire topic. I am a social

psychologist interested in research on human relations within and between groups. My attempts are directed toward integrating findings and conclusions on these topics. But surely it would be impertinent for me, from the angle of social psychology alone, to write prescriptions or offer a panacea for the social responsibilities of those who actually plan and work with groups.

36 First I shall raise the problem of social responsibility and delineate that facet which lies within my area of research as a social psychologist. Then I shall depart from the realm of the abstract to analyze this facet of the problem in terms of experiments on relations within and between groups which were undertaken specifically to study responsibility, solidarity, and morale as social-psychological problems.

The term "responsibility" is used in several senses. Therefore, we have to specify the exact sense in which we shall use it in this presentation. In one sense, responsibility implies being accountable to others under the coercion of external pressures, sanctions, and correctives. In this sense, the problem of responsibility in actual social life leads immediately to analysis in administrative, legal, and power terms—terms which are beyond my ken as a social psychologist.

In another sense, social responsibility implies inner promptings and inner urgency. In this sense, the individual feels accountable to uphold certain values because he feels certain things *should* be done, certain values *should* be upheld, certain aims *must* be achieved, and certain desirable standards in human relations *must* be observed. This is the kind of social responsibility with which this paper is concerned.

22 Social responsibility in this sense is not an abstract quality or state of mind that descends on individuals every once in a while. Social responsibility, or lack of it, is an aspect of human relations in all its forms, whether within groups or between groups. Therefore, realistic analysis of responsibility traces this aspect of human relations as it develops in reciprocal interactions of man with man in their respective groups and between their respective groups.

One familiar approach to the analysis of inner responsibility or

"conscience" finds its origins in the restraints and frustrations of the individual's instinctive impulses early in life by the coercive authority of adults. This approach is characteristic especially of orthodox psychoanalysis. At another extreme, there are sociologists who consider the development of responsibility almost as a process of pouring social standards or values into a passive individual recipient.

Those of you in social group work are in a fortunate position to see the rich actualities of life which the research literature merely abstracts. From either vantage point, it is apparent that neither a strictly individualistic account or a strictly sociocultural account can do justice to the actualities of inner responsibility, social conscience, feelings of solidarity and morale, which are complex psychological formations unique to man. This fact is recognized by leaders in group work, like Eduard Lindeman, Wilbur I. Newstetter, and Grace Coyle, as well as by recent trends in social psychology.

The modern trend in social-psychological theory recognizes that the "personal" and the "social" are everywhere intertwined in human relations and in personal development. Psychological formations like inner responsibility, conscience, and feelings of solidarity are joint products of influences stemming from within the individual and stemming from his sociocultural setting. Influences from the individual himself and influences external to him are always functionally related.

Therefore, the worn-out conceptions which place the individual and the group at opposite poles, considering the group as necessarily the enemy of individual development, can only impede clarification of social responsibility and related phenomena, such as group identification, group leadership, and solidarity.

Social responsibility, in the sense of inner accountability to one's fellow men in personal and group relations, emerges when relevant values become part and parcel of what he considers as his "self." Feelings of responsibility from within are constituents of the individual's self-image. The formation of a self-image by the individual, with highly cherished personal values toward his

(43)

51



neighbors and toward groups he deals with, is a product of his free participation in group activities with other human beings toward goals which he shares with them.

This conception of individual development and group functioning as intimately related processes lies at the basis of the experiments I shall report to you in very brief form. Such an integrative approach, which conceives of individual and group as functionally interdependent, has received repeated confirmation in sociological studies of small groups and in various psychological studies. Here, I can mention just one of the psychological studies, namely, the impressive series carried out by the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget, on the development of moral judgment and responsibility.<sup>1</sup>

38 Piaget studied the developmental transition in the moral judgment of the individual. In one study, one group of children six to eight years of age and one group nine to twelve years of age were asked what kinds of behavior they considered unfair or wrong. The younger children considered acts unfair or wrong which were forbidden by their parents and other grownups. At the ages of six to eight years, they seldom noted acts of inequality as unfair. Nor were acts of social injustice considered unfair by these children. In order to have a notion of inequality of treatment among individuals, the child must recognize and participate in reciprocal relations with others, especially age-mates; he has to be aware of mutual responsibilities and feel obligations prompted from within.

On the other hand, the older children of nine to twelve very seldom reported forbidden acts as unfair, but considered 73 percent of the cases of inequality as unfair. A few cases of social injustice arising from lack of equity were also called unfair by these older children. Piaget concluded that through participation in interaction with others on a reciprocal basis, the child's moral values develop from those imposed by others, particularly grownups, to a growing realization of mutual obligations and inner responsibility to others.

In short, such abstract conceptions as social responsibility, solidarity, and morale arise from the reciprocal relations of man to man and group to group. Apart from such functional relations

<sup>1</sup> Jean Piaget, *The Moral Judgment of the Child* (London: Kegan, Paul, 1932).



in small and large groups, social responsibility, solidarity, and morale have little real meaning. Therefore, as one concrete illustration I turn now to our research on actual reciprocal relations in which social responsibility and solidarity arise and operate.

Since 1948 a program of research has been under way under my direction to test some hypotheses derived from sociological, psychological, and everyday-life accounts of group life. This research program included three large-scale experiments carried out in 1949, 1953, and 1954.<sup>2</sup> The conclusions in this paper are based on the 1949 and 1954 experiments.

An over-all aim of these experiments was to create conditions in which groups would form naturally and to observe how an individual became an active and responsible part of the group. We were interested in testing hypotheses concerning essential conditions for the development of inner responsibility to group values on the part of individual members. This aim required that we start with individuals who did not know each other. As the first stage in the experiments, groups were formed and their interaction observed over a period of time.

Our interest in group values was not confined to desired means and ends within the confines of one group. We were equally concerned with values and attitudes pertaining to behavior toward other groups. The next problem, therefore, concerned the limiting conditions for the formation of friendly or hostile evaluations of other groups and friendly or hostile treatment of their members.

In the next stage of the experiments, accordingly, the groups which were formed at the initial step were brought into contact. Since friction between groups is the most challenging problem in intergroup relations today, the first contact between groups took place in competitive and mutually frustrating conditions.

<sup>2</sup> The first experiment carried out in 1949 is reported in M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif, *Groups in Harmony and Tension* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953). It was sponsored by the Yale Attitude Change Program and the American Jewish Committee. The 1953 and 1954 experiments were carried out with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Results of these experiments are reported in M. Sherif, B. Jack White, and O. J. Harvey, "Status in Experimentally Produced Groups," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX (1955), 370-79; and in M. Sherif et al., *Experimental Study of Positive and Negative Intergroup Attitudes between Experimentally Produced Groups* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma, 1954; multilithed).

Finally, in the 1954 experiment, an attempt was made to reduce the friction between groups engendered by conditions of rivalry and mutual frustration. In other words, the aim was to establish conditions for interaction between groups conducive to willing and active cooperation with another group, which had formerly been seen as an "enemy."

(19) From my own limited contact with the literature and practice of social group work, I believe you may find that procedures used in these experiments have a good deal in common with methods advanced by some of the leaders in the group work field. The chief difference is that in the experiments I shall briefly describe, methods and techniques were employed in situations planned to test certain hypotheses in a systematic fashion.

In the first place, every effort was made that the situation appear natural and lifelike to the individuals participating in the experiment. The settings of these experiments were summer camps. The subjects were eleven-and-twelve-year-old pre-adolescent boys, who find camping activities fascinating.

54 The primary technique for securing data was that of the participant observer. The subjects were not aware that their behavior was constantly being observed. The experimental staff appeared to them to be regular personnel of the camp. No staff member appeared as a psychologist or investigator so far as the subjects were concerned. There is both empirical and experimental evidence that individuals *are* mindful of being observed, especially by persons with authority and especially if their actions relate to personal concerns and personal relations with others.<sup>3</sup>

There is always the possibility, of course, that observers may be highly selective in reporting in spite of all the precautions strictly observed. Therefore, observations were cross-checked with several other techniques. Candid recordings and candid pictures were made whenever possible without cluttering the natural flow of interaction. Sociometric choices were obtained. At crucial points we took advantage of developments in the laboratory which per-

<sup>3</sup> For example, see F. B. Miller, "'Resistentialism' in Applied Social Research," *Human Organization*, XII (1954), 5-8; S. Wapner and T. G. Alper, "The Effect of an Audience on Behavior in a Choice Situation," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVII (1952), 222-29.

mit one to obtain evidence of a person's attitudes indirectly, without his awareness of the purpose of the task.<sup>4</sup> Conclusions which I shall draw here are based on results cross-checked by two or more of these techniques.

In producing groups, in producing conflict between them, and in reducing that conflict, no special lecture methods or discussion methods or leadership training were introduced. On the contrary, the adult staff was instructed not to intervene in interaction or in decisions made by the boys until they *wanted* help in carrying out their decisions. Thus, the methods in the experiment resembled closely the enabling method in social group work described by Wilson and Ryland<sup>5</sup> and by Friedlander.<sup>6</sup> I take it that the main objective of the enabling method is to assist group members as they take responsibility in planning and making decisions, and not to take over these leadership and initiative functions from the group.

The planning of the experiment in successive stages was possible by controlling and altering conditions external to the groups. This procedure is not, I believe, foreign to the theory of group work. In 1935 Newstetter wrote of "guidance and stimulation primarily through influence on the social and physical setting of the group rather than through the direct personal influence or authority of the worker."<sup>7</sup> In each stage of the experiment, problem situations were introduced appropriate to the chief characteristics of the experimental conditions of that stage. These problem situations were introduced quite naturally. Before and during the experiment, we studied the interests and concerns of the subjects. The problem situations had high appeal value, and they were real to these boys. Therefore, they could not be ignored easily by any individual. For example, the problem of getting a

<sup>4</sup> For a convenient summary of the experiments and these techniques, see Chapters 6 and 9 in M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956). Other research using indirect or disguised techniques for assessing attitudes is reported in Chapters 13, 15, and 17 of that book.

<sup>5</sup> Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, *Social Group Work Practice* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949), pp. 60-61.

<sup>6</sup> W. A. Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955), p. 419.

<sup>7</sup> Wilber I. Newstetter, "What Is Social Group Work?" in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 1935 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 294.

meal on their own initiative was introduced when participating individuals were hungry. Or, a boat was placed near their cabin, which was some distance from the water. Moving the boat they all wanted to take to the water required coordination of everyone's activities and efforts.

56 When problem situations are immediate, compelling, and embody a highly desired goal, group members *do* initiate discussion, *do* plan and carry through their plans. In this process, discussion has a place, planning has a place, action has a place, and even lecture or information has a place. The sequence of these related activities need not be the same in all cases.

The experiments proper started with the selection of subjects by rigorous criteria. These criteria were necessary to rule out the possibility that results could be explained in terms of background differences among the boys, social maladjustment, undue childhood frustrations, or previous interpersonal relations with one another. The subjects were not acquainted prior to the experiments. They were healthy, normal boys around the ages of eleven and twelve, socially well adjusted in school and neighborhood, and academically successful. They came from settled, well-adjusted families of middle- or lower-middle-class and Protestant affiliations. No subject came from a broken home. The mean I.Q. was above average.

The subjects were divided between two separate cabins at some distance from one another, in such a way that the boys in each cabin were similar to those in the other cabin in size, athletic skills, and the like. During the first stage of the experiment, these two groups were kept separate.

Our hypothesis was that when these individuals interacted with one another repeatedly in problem situations which embodied highly appealing goals and which required interdependent activities, they would organize themselves, on an informal basis, as a group without exhortations from outside to pull together. A definite group structure or organization would take shape, which would be revealed through observers' ratings of status and through sociometric choices. Certain ways of doing things, certain preferences for activities, certain desirable ways of behaving and de-

sirable ends to pursue, would become standardized in each group. In other words, social norms or values would be shared and standardized in each group. Finally, as a group organization took shape and values were standardized, individuals in each group would function in a responsible way as group members with particular roles and would hold themselves accountable to maintain and advance the values of the group.

Formal programming during this period was kept to a minimum. As Newstetter<sup>8</sup> and Coyle<sup>9</sup> have noted, a formal program handed down is not the most effective means for development of group initiative or morale. As much as possible, the boys were allowed to engage in activities they preferred at the times they chose and as often as they wished (limited, of course, by health considerations). During these activities, compelling problem situations arose which required coordinated efforts. (I have mentioned the problem of transporting a boat to the water.) The boys were fascinated with camping out. Tents had to be assembled and pitched. There were meals to be prepared in the woods, from ingredients furnished in the bulk, such as hamburger, chunks of meat, soft drink powders, and uncut watermelon. Division of labor was required. Evening campfires presented the problem of entertainment, which the boys supplied each other.

As a result of repeated interaction in such situations, groups did begin to form. The boys pooled their efforts, divided up tasks, became acquainted with each other's particular personal characteristics. After about a week, the independent ratings of observers on two successive days of the status or social positions in each group were highly correlated (a rank order of .92 for one group and .98 for the other). Leaders emerged in each group. Some boys sifted to the bottom. Others became lieutenants or attained other positions in the group through proficiency in some activity.

Each group appropriated certain places and things as *their* property. One group named their swimming place and campfire, and put up signs to identify them. The other discovered an

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Grace L. Coyle, *Group Work with American Youth* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948).

athletic field and worked hard to improve it. They called it "ours." Each group adopted a name and stenciled it on their shirts. In the 1954 experiment, one group called themselves the "Rattlers"; the other, the "Eagles." Each group had their own favorite songs, favorite games, and favored ways of carrying out their activities. One group spontaneously organized a system of swimmer escorts and a protective circle in the water to encourage all members to learn to swim and dive well. In spite of their similarity and similar location, these desired modes of behavior differed in the two groups. In one, toughness was highly prized. In the other, swear words were frowned upon. These qualities became personal characteristics of each member which he exhibited whenever occasion arose.

In short, group norms or values were shared and standardized in each group. Because these values emerged in the course of activities which the individuals themselves initiated, planned, and carried out, the *group* values became *their* values. The group was seen as *their* group. Undesirable modes of behavior in terms of the values or norms of their group were recognized with disapproval, frosty silence, or scorn. Thus all came to know what were the desired modes of behavior and the desirable ends to pursue. They came to consider these as their own personal desires and own personal preferences. Thus they upheld them with a sense of inner responsibility.

These findings concerning inner responsibility to the values of a group, I believe, are not surprising to you who work with groups. They verify repeated findings in sociological literature. They support the conclusion reached by Piaget in his extensive studies of the development of moral values. As you will recall, Piaget concluded that mere compliance with rules and values imposed by outside authority gave way to free and autonomous pursuit of values only when a child participated as an equal with other children on the basis of genuine reciprocity.

Once groups were formed in our experiments, we brought them into contact with each other under conditions which were conducive to friction between them. The essential characteristic of experimental conditions in this stage was that goals could be at-



tained by one group only at the expense of the other. This condition was arranged quite naturally, since each group was eager to engage in competitive sports. A tournament of games was arranged, as though we were acceding to their repeated requests. Handsome prizes were to be given to the winning group. The Rattlers, who had appropriated and prepared the athletic field, made it available for the contests.

Members of both groups pitched in with all their energies and determination to win. One group held a prayer for victory before each contest. They devised special strategies to outwit and outmaneuver the other group.

Our hypothesis was that in conditions which were competitive and mutually frustrating, members of each group would develop hostile attitudes toward, and unfavorable stereotypes of, the other group and its members. In other words, responsibility to their own group would, under these conditions, imply hostility to the other group.

At first, good sportmanship was evident on both sides. But during the course of victories, defeats, and renewed efforts to win, intergroup friction developed. A series of mutually frustrating events arose during the tournament. Following a defeat, the Eagles stayed behind on the athletic field and burned the banner which the Rattlers had left there. When the Rattlers discovered their burned flag the next morning, they were outraged and determined to punish the guilty parties. It is important, I think, to note that their reaction was not simply one of blind rage. They planned a strategy, on their own initiative, for determining whether the Eagles were guilty and for starting a fight if they were. This strategy was carried out as planned, with both groups scuffling over each other's flags.

From this time on, name-calling and hostile acts marked the contact between the two groups. The Rattlers raided the Eagles' cabin, taking the Eagle leader's blue jeans and painting on them the legend "The Last of the Eagles." These were carried like a banner.

Each group appeared to the other as an enemy. Members of the out-group were labeled "sneaks," "cheaters," or called by even



more undesirable names. Attitudes of social distance between the groups became so marked that neither wanted anything further to do with the other. Of course, different individuals expressed their hostility toward the out-group in different ways. But in one way or another, every individual manifested the antagonism shared by his group. Furthermore, this antagonism, the stereotyped notions of individuals in the other group, and the great social distance between them persisted after the contests were over and the experimental stage was concluded.

If there are any doubts of the zeal displayed by these boys in supporting their group in its positive aims toward victory and its efforts to defeat and humiliate the other group, I believe the pictures taken on the spot will dispel them. In the 1949 study, photographs of each group were taken immediately after the tournaments ended. No one can mistake the joyful faces of the victors or the downcast expressions of the losers. Victory of one's group aroused *personal* joy. Defeat of one's group meant *personal* frustration.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from this stage of the experiment is that inner responsibility and accountability to one's own group do not guarantee responsible treatment of members of other groups, if the values of one's own group require hostility and social distance to the out-groups. Under conditions such as these, being a responsible group member means active and willing participation in hostile and aggressive actions toward the out-group.

As the final stage in the 1954 experiment, conditions were introduced which were designed to reduce friction between the groups and to replace the negative evaluation of the out-group with attitudes of friendship and cooperation. As a first step, the groups were brought into contact in activities which were satisfying for members of each group, but did not require interdependent activities involving both groups. This phase was introduced to see if removing the conditions which had produced hostility between the groups would reduce the hostility. The groups ate together in the same dining hall; they attended a movie in the same building; they carried out various entertainments side

by side. However, their antagonism, the name-calling, and derogation of the out-group continued. They used these contact situations as opportunities to intensify intergroup hostility. For example, at meals they shouted unfavorable names at each other, even throwing food and other objects.

Following this series of intergroup contacts, the main effort to reduce intergroup antagonism was made. Our hypothesis was that if the conflicting groups were brought into contact in conditions embodying goals which were compelling and desirable to both groups, but which could not be achieved by the efforts and resources of one group separately, they would tend to cooperate toward the common goal. Such goals may be termed "superordinate goals," in the sense that they are desired by members of both groups but require that both groups pull together to attain them.

It was too much to expect that the friction, stereotypes, and social distance between groups would disappear in one episode. Therefore, the next hypothesis predicted that a series of interaction situations embodying superordinate goals would have a cumulative effect in reducing conflict.

A series of problem situations embodying superordinate goals was introduced. There was no preaching, no lecturing, no adult-led discussion. The problem situations were varied, but all had an essential feature in common. All of them involved goals that became focal for both groups. The goals were urgent to these individuals; they could not be ignored. Yet their attainment clearly depended on communication, planning, and joint action by members of both groups.

The problem situations embodying superordinate goals included joint efforts to cope with a water shortage that affected all individuals and could not help being compelling. They included securing a much-desired movie, which could not be obtained by either group alone. They included an overnight camp-out where several situations arose, as planned, that required their joint efforts.

On the camp-out, for example, the truck, which was the only available transportation by which they could go for their food, stalled (as planned) just when the boys were getting hungry. It

was a large truck, too large to be pushed even by both groups. The two groups had to work out a plan together. The plan adopted employed the big tug-of-war rope which had been used but a short time before in the bitter rivalry during the tournament. This time, however, both groups pulled together on two lines of rope tied to the truck, and succeeded in getting it started.

At first, cooperation between the groups was confined to the problem situations embodying superordinate goals. Following attainment of the goal, the old bickering and name-calling tended to reappear. Gradually, however, intergroup cooperation was extended by the individuals themselves to widening areas of activities. The first was agreement to take turns going first into the mess hall. Following the successful attempt to start the truck, the two groups prepared a meal together. At length, spontaneous cooperation and friendship between the groups extended to joint entertainments around the campfire, which the boys organized themselves. Even the order of performance was the result of their own planning.

When the experiment was over, boys of both groups came to the staff requesting that they all go home in the same bus, instead of in the separate buses in which they had arrived. This request was granted. The bus made a rest stop on the way home. One group had five dollars which they had won in one of the contests. Their plans for spending it at camp had not worked out. At the refreshment stand, their leader suggested that the five dollars be spent on malted milks for all the boys in both groups. All of his group agreed. This meant that malted milks for everyone would be paid for by one group, but that everyone would have to buy his own sandwiches and other treats. The group which contributed the money was fully aware that the five dollars would have paid for everything that they themselves would have ordered. Nevertheless, they preferred to share it.

The conclusion was clear that cooperation between groups prompted by a series of superordinate goals had the cumulative effect of reducing friction between groups and engendering friendship and favorable evaluations of the other group. This conclusion was supported both by observation and by other results

which were treated statistically and found significant. Friendship choices were extended for the first time to members of the out-group. Ratings of the personal characteristics or stereotypes of the other group shifted from largely unfavorable ratings to largely favorable ratings. The categorical verdicts that "all of the other group are stinkers, cheats, sneaky" and the like fell to almost nothing.

On the basis of these experiments, certain conclusions and implications for understanding social responsibility are evident. Responsibility is necessarily in relation to other people with whom one has some relationship. Behavior is evaluated as responsible or as not responsible in terms of values or norms which are recognized by at least two people. Typically, responsibility in social life is evaluated in terms of the values of the groups to which a person belongs. The values upheld by the "responsible" person are those of his reference groups, such as his family, school, play group, gang, club, work group, professional group, community, and nation.

The experiments summarized support the proposition that when individuals interact in activities embodying common goals with high appeal value, a group organization and group values are produced. As a participant in the planning, discussions, decisions, and actions in which the group and its values formed, the individual member takes the group decisions and values as his own personal decisions and values. He behaves in responsible fashion in terms of the status arrangements and values of the group and holds himself personally accountable to do so.

But when his group is in conflict with another group, the individual takes responsibility in furthering intergroup friction and in derogation of the antagonist. In the experiments, healthy, normal individuals zealously pursued a course which was notably responsible in terms of their own group values and aims, but flagrantly irresponsible in terms of the other group.

When the two groups faced superordinate goals which both desired, but neither could attain separately, then individuals in both groups began to experience feelings of friendship and inner responsibility in cooperating with the other group. These inner

promptings were not the outcome of inherent or basic personality traits. These personal promptings and urges grew because the values of one's own group had changed to friendliness and helpfulness toward the other group. Manifestations of personal characteristics along these lines became the concern of each individual with a sense of inner urgency.

This is a demonstration in miniature of the fact that groups can develop responsibility to one another when aims common to both are immediate rather than abstract, and require the efforts and resources of the groups in question. In terms of the individual, such conditions widen the horizons of personal responsibility. But they do not lessen the inner promptings to be accountable. For the values of friendship and cooperativeness with other groups are values of his own group, just as much as norms of social distance and prejudice. Just as he does other values of his group, he considers them his values, his personal preferences and desires.

Surely our investigation of social responsibility should not stop within the confines of one group, one neighborhood, or one community. Modern differentiated societies require that we turn increasingly in research and practice to the problems of social responsibility to other groups in ever widening circles.

## *Appendix A: Program*

THE MAJOR FUNCTION of the National Conference of Social Work (NCSW) is to provide a dynamic educational forum for the critical examination of basic welfare problems and issues.

Programs of the Annual Forums are divided into two parts: (1) the General Sessions and the meetings of the section and common services committees, all of which are arranged by the NCSW Program Committee; and (2) meetings which are arranged by the associate and special groups affiliated with the NCSW.

In addition to arranging these meetings, associate and special groups participate in the over-all planning of the Annual Forum programs.

In order that the NCSW may continue to provide a democratic forum in which all points of view are represented, it is prohibited by its Constitution from taking positions on social issues. Individuals appearing on Annual Forum programs speak for themselves and have no authority to use the name of the NCSW in any way which would imply that the organization has participated in or endorsed their statements or positions.

### *General Theme: The Challenge of Change*

*SUNDAY, MAY 20*

3:00 P.M.-4:00 P.M.

#### *Orientation Session For Newcomers*

C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia

Ruth M. Williams, Assistant Executive Secretary, National Conference of Social Work

Floor discussion

8:30 P.M.

#### *General Session. The Challenge of Change*

Presiding: Jane Hoey, former President, National Conference of Social Work; Director of Social Research, National Tuberculosis Association, New York

Invocation: Dr. O. Walter Wagner, Executive Director, Metropolitan Church Federation, St. Louis

Greetings by the Honorable Raymond Tucker, Mayor of St. Louis  
Welcome on behalf of the St. Louis Sponsoring Committee

Mrs. Harry L. Esserman, Chairman

Benjamin E. Youngdahl, President, National Conference of Social Work; Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

### MONDAY, MAY 21

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

#### *General Session. Our Challenge in Social Welfare*

Presiding: Mrs. Eveline M. Burns, First Vice-President, National Conference of Social Work; Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York  
Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; formerly Treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

#### *Section I. Services to Individuals and Families*

##### *The Nature of Personality Change in Casework Treatment*

Presiding: Mary C. Hester, Chairman of Section I; Associate Professor of Social Work, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

Florence Hollis, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Discussant: Esther H. Clemence, Associate Professor of Social Work, Smith College School for Social Work, Northampton, Mass.

#### *Section II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups*

##### *Social Responsibility and the Group—Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lecture*

Presiding: Paul Simon, Chairman of Section II; Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana  
Muzafer Sherif, Director, Institute of Group Relations, University of Oklahoma, Norman

#### *Section III. Services to Agencies and Communities*

##### *Community Development in Underdeveloped Areas as Viewed by the Social Work Member of an ICA Technical Team.*



Presiding: Daniel R. Elliott, Chairman of Section III; Associate Director, Welfare Federation of Cleveland  
Ernest F. Witte, Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education, New York

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

**Discussion Films**

Discussion leader: Oscar Cohen, Director, Program Division, Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, New York

"Leaving It to the Experts." National Film Board of Canada, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York

"Community Responsibility." National Film Board of Canada, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York

"Can We Immunize against Prejudice?" Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York

Floor discussion

2:00 P.M.—3:00 P.M.

*Section I. Services to Individuals and Families*

**GROUP MEETING 1. AN EVALUATION OF SUPERVISION**

Presiding: Esther H. Clemence, Associate Professor of Social Work, Smith College School for Social Work, Northampton, Mass.

Lucille N. Austin, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Discussant: Mrs. Patricia Sacks Fingert, St. Louis

**GROUP MEETING 2. CONCEPT OF MARITAL BALANCE—ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CASEWORK TREATMENT**

Presiding: Bernice Bish, Executive Director, Family Service of Kansas City

Carol H. Meyer, Assistant Professor of Social Work, Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service, New York University, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 3. GENERAL PERSPECTIVES ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

Presiding: Manuel Kaufman, Deputy Commissioner, Philadelphia Department of Public Welfare

**The Culture and Values of the Juvenile Delinquent**

Mrs. Elliot Studt, Director of Training, Delinquency Division, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

**Mobilization of Community Resources for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency and the Treatment of the Juvenile Delinquent**

Maurice O. Hunt, Chief, Bureau of Child Welfare, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 4. THE PLACE OF MEDICAL CARE IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Presiding: Roland Artigues, Associate Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana

Franz Goldmann, M.D., Associate Professor of Medical Care, School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston

Discussants: Herbert Notkin, M.D., Medical Director, Onondaga County Department of Public Welfare, Syracuse, N.Y.; I. J. Brightman, M.D., Assistant Commissioner, Welfare Medical Services, New York State Department of Social Welfare, Albany

**GROUP MEETING 5. THE ADOLESCENT EGO**

Presiding: Fred P. DelliQuadri, Director, Division for Children and Youth, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, Madison

Observations on the Structure of the Adolescent Ego and Its Implications for Casework Treatment

Solomon O. Lichter, Executive Director, Scholarship and Guidance Association, Chicago

Ego-centered Treatment of an Adolescent Girl

Vera S. Margolis, Caseworker, Jewish Family and Community Service, Chicago

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 6. DESIRABLE SCOPE OF PUBLIC WELFARE**

Presiding: Henry F. Chadeayne, Treasurer, General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis

Joseph E. Baldwin, Director, Milwaukee County Department of Public Welfare

Discussant: Frederick A. Breyer, Director, Hamilton County Welfare Department, Cincinnati

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 7. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE WORK OF A PSYCHIATRIC CLINIC AND A FAMILY AGENCY**

Presiding: M. Robert Gomberg, Executive Director, Jewish Family Service, New York

Introduction

Jules V. Coleman, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine and Physician-in-Charge, Psychiatric Clinic, Grace-New Haven Community Hospital

Emerson Holcomb, Executive Secretary, Family Service of New Haven, New Haven, Conn.

Methodology

Mrs. Ruth Janowicz, Research Assistant, Family Service of New Haven and Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Conn.

Who Come and What Problems Do They Bring?

Stephen Fleck, M.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry and Public Welfare, Yale University School of Medicine and Medical Director of Yale Psychiatric Institute, New Haven, Conn.

Nea M. Norton, Chief Social Worker, Department of Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Conn.

Implications

Jules V. Coleman, M.D.

Emerson Holcomb

GROUP MEETING 8. PROTECTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN SERVICES FOR THE AGED

Presiding: Maurice J. Ostomel, Assistant Executive Secretary, Welfare Planning Council, Los Angeles Region

A Family Agency and Protective Services to the Aged Client

Jane Garrettson, Supervisor of Services for the Aged, Family Service Bureau, United Charities of Chicago

Legal Techniques: the Law as a Resource to Implement Casework Services

Virginia Lehmann, attorney, Legal Aid Bureau, United Charities of Chicago

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 9. RELIGION AND SOCIAL WORK ETHIC

Presiding: Sue Spencer, Director, School of Social Work, University of Tennessee, Nashville

Rev. Felix P. Biestek, S.J., Director of Field Work, School of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago

Sanford Solender, Director, Jewish Community Center Division, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

Louis Towley, Professor of Social Work, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

GROUP MEETING 10. REHABILITATION—MODERN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Presiding: Chauncey A. Alexander, Associate Director, Los Angeles County Heart Association

Eugene J. Taylor, editorial staff, *New York Times*; Assistant Professor of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Bellevue Medical Center, New York University

Discussants: Jack Behrens, Missouri State Vocational Rehabilitation Service, St. Louis; Eileen Cassidy, Chief, Social Work Service, Veterans Hospital, San Francisco; Rosamond Tatro, Medical Social Work Consultant, American Cancer Society, New York

*Section II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups*

GROUP MEETING 1. GROUP WORK IN AUTHORITATIVE SETTINGS

Presiding: Julius Samuels, Assistant Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

The Use of Social Work in the Authoritative Setting

Hans A. Illing, Jewish Committee for Personal Service, Los Angeles

A Group Program for Emotionally Disturbed, Delinquent, and/or Neglected Children

Malcolm J. Marks, group therapist, Wiltwyck School for Boys, New York

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 2. SOCIAL GROUP WORK AND PUBLIC RECREATION

Presiding and discussion leader: Charles F. Wright, Director, Group Work and Recreation Division, Community Welfare Council of Hennepin County, Minneapolis

The Expanding Field of Public Recreation

Joseph Prendergast, Executive Director, National Recreation Association, New York

Implications for Group Work in Public Recreation

Kenneth W. Kindelsperger, Associate Professor of Social Group Work, Cooperative Social Work Program, University of Buffalo, Syracuse University

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 3. THE NATIONAL YOUTH-SERVING PROGRAMS AND THE USE OF GROUP WORK

Presiding: John McDowell, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York  
Professional and Volunteer Leadership in the National Youth-serving Agencies

Ruby Pernell, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Relationship between Social Work Staff and Other Specialists in National Agency Programs

Helen Wilson, Executive Director, Girl Scouts of Chicago

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 4. GROUP LIVING EXPERIENCE IN CAMPING

Presiding: Homer C. Bishop, Professor George Warren Brown, School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

Sam Kadison, Director, Camp Modin, New York

Panel Members: Gunnar Dybwad, Executive Director, Child Study Association of America, New York; Hugh W. Ransom, Executive Director, American Camping Association, New York; Homer Bishop, Professor of Group Work, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis; Milton Goldberg, Executive Director, Jewish Big Brothers Association of Los Angeles; Fritz Redl, Director, Children's Unit, Clinical Investigation Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Md.; Dorothea Spellman, Professor of Group Work, School of Social Work, University of Denver

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 5. GROUP SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS AND SMALL COMMUNITIES

Presiding: Paul Brotsman, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Kansas University, Lawrence

Group Experiences in Rural Areas

Rosemary Conzemius, Associate State Club Leader, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Connecticut, Storrs

Problems of Auspices and Structure in Providing Group Services in Smaller Communities

Elizabeth B. Herring, Executive Secretary, National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, Washington, D.C.

Floor discussion

*Section III. Services to Agencies and Communities*

Demography and Human Ecology in Relation to Social Work—Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lecture

Presiding: Campbell G. Murphy, Executive Secretary, Community Welfare Council of Dayton and Montgomery County, Ohio

Philip Hauser, Professor of Sociology and Director, Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago

Floor discussion

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Toward a Dynamic Interpretation of Social Work through Films

Part I. Production: Professional Goals—Ways and Means—Creative Techniques

Presiding: Elizabeth Ross, Deputy Chief, Children's Bureau, So-

cial Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Panel members: James Scull, Director of Public Relations, Family Service Association of America, New York; Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Dean, School of Social Work, Boston University; Irving Jacoby, producer, writer, director, New York

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

*Committee on Financing of Social Welfare Services (co-sponsoring group: Section III)*

*Federated Financing and United Funds*

Panel chairman: Homer C. Wadsworth, Executive Director, Kansas City Association of Trusts and Foundations

Panel Members: Richard E. Booth, Executive Vice President, United Fund of Greater St. Louis; W. D. Bryant, Executive Director, Community Studies, Inc., Kansas City; Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, New York; Thomas Reid, Director, Office of Civic Affairs, Ford Motor Co., Detroit

*Committee on Methods of Social Action*

*How Do We Carry on Social Action toward Social Welfare Objectives—Local, State, and National?*

Presiding: Arthur Dunham, Professor of Community Organization, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
Robert H. MacRae, Executive Director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago

Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, Secretary, National Committee on the Aging, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York

Discussant: Nelson C. Jackson, Director of Community Services, National Urban League, New York

*Committee on Personnel and Administration*

*The Chronic Shortage of Personnel in the Field of Social Welfare—a Challenge to Both Schools and Agencies*

Panel chairman: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman, Committee on Personnel and Administration; Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York

Panel members: Donald S. Howard, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Los Angeles; Ryland Crary, School of Education, Washington University, St. Louis; Anna Fillmore, General Director, National League for Nursing, New York;

Evalyn Weller, Principal Staff Development Specialist, Division of Technical Training, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Floor discussion

*Section III. Services to Agencies and Communities (joint session with Committee on Financing of Social Welfare Services)*

Federated Financing and United Funds

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Toward a Dynamic Interpretation of Social Work through Films

Part II—Use: Realizing the Film's Full Potential

Presiding: Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Dean, School of Social Work, Boston University

Screening of "A Family Affair." Mental Health Film Board, 164 East 38th Street, New York

The Variety of Purposes and Methods in Film Discussion Meetings

Mrs. Aline B. Auerbach, Director, Department of Parent Group Education, Child Study Association of America, New York

How Family Agencies Are Using "A Family Affair"

James H. Scull, Director of Public Relations, Family Service Association of America, New York

6:00 P.M.—8:00 P.M.

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Feature

"Umberto D." Harrison & Davidson, 1501 Broadway, New York

8:30 P.M.

*General Session. Conformity and Freedom*

Presiding: Benjamin E. Youngdahl, President, National Conference of Social Work; Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

Telford Taylor, attorney, author; formerly Chief Prosecutor, Nuremberg war crimes trials, New York

10:00 P.M.

*National Conference of Social Work Reception*



## TUESDAY, MAY 22

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Does Mass Support Mean Increased Public Understanding?*

Presiding: William H. Beatty, General Manager, R. L. Polk and Co.; Vice President, Travelers Aid; board member, United Foundation, Detroit

1. On Being an Individual Agency  
Barbara Abel, Editor, *Community*, United Community Funds and Councils of America, New York
2. Helping Agencies to Be Known on Their Own  
Chester C. Ridge, Executive Director, United Fund and Community Council of Houston
3. Agency Identity—from the Inside Looking Out  
Martha Allen, Executive Director, Camp Fire Girls, Inc., New York

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Communications—Theory and Practice*

Presiding: Chauncey A. Alexander, Associate Director, Los Angeles County Heart Association

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. A Nation on the Move—How? Who? Where?*

Presiding: Laurin Hyde, General Director, National Travelers Aid Association, New York

- A Fluid Labor Force and Our Expanding Economy  
Robert C. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
- Human Values—Personal Problems When You Move  
Elsie Rogers, Executive Secretary, Travelers Aid Society, Long Beach, Calif.

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Agency Teamwork in Older Communities*

Presiding: Max Silverstein, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Mental Health, Inc., Philadelphia

1. Agency Teamwork in a Community-wide Needs-Resources Survey  
C. F. McNeil, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia
2. The Family-centered Project of St. Paul: an Experience in Working Together

Malcolm Stinson, Research Consultant, Family Centered Project,  
Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Council.

Discussion leader: Elmer J. Tropman, Executive Director, Health  
and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. The Important Elements in  
Stimulating Citizen Responsibility*

Presiding: Mrs. Frances T. Cahn, Executive Director, National  
Council of Women, New York

What Are the Motivations That Make People Volunteer?—a Scientific  
Approach

Jules V. Coleman, M.D., Yale University School of Medicine, New  
Haven, Conn.

Recognition and Utilization of These Motivations—Placements,  
Supervision, Training

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Working Mothers*

Presiding: Teresa A. Farrell, Associate Director, Michigan Wel-  
fare League, Lansing

Maintaining Family Service in a Changing Economy

Judith Cauman, Day Care Consultant, Child Welfare League of  
America, New York

Floor discussion

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Home Care for the Chronically Ill

Discussion Leader: Mrs. Minna Field, Assistant to the Chief, Di-  
vision of Social Medicine, Montefiore Hospital, New York

"Home Care." Montefiore Hospital, 210th Street and Bainbridge Ave-  
nue, New York

Floor discussion

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. The Public Relations Team  
in a Social Agency*

Presiding: R. Fullerton Place, Director of Public Relations,  
United Fund of Greater St. Louis

On Promoting Agency Teamwork

Mrs. Sallie E. Bright, Director, Department of Public Interest,  
Community Service Society of New York

Experience from a Business Organization in Public Relations Team-  
work

G. M. Philpott, Vice President, Ralston-Purina Co., St. Louis

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Interprofessional Communications—a Test Case Symposium*

Moderator: Chauncey A. Alexander, Associate Director, Los Angeles County Heart Association

Panel members: Nathalie Kennedy, Chief of Social Service, University of California at Los Angeles Medical Center; Mrs. Mildred Kaune, Health Counselor, School District R-9, Lemay, Mo.; Ivan Lee Holt, Circuit Court, Eighth Judicial Circuit of Missouri, St. Louis; Rev. Carl Siegenthaler, Caroline Mission, St. Louis

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Are Residence Laws Here to Stay?*

Presiding: Laurin Hyde, General Director, National Travelers Aid Association, New York

*Let's Face Up to Restrictive Residence Laws*

Elizabeth Wickenden, Consultant on Public Welfare, New York

*What Happens in a State without Residence Restrictions?*

Peter Kasius, Deputy Commissioner for New York City Affairs, New York State Department of Social Welfare, New York

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Agency Teamwork in Older Communities*

Presiding: Elmer J. Tropman, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

*Agency Teamwork in the Rehabilitation of the Mentally Ill*

Hester B. Crutcher, Director of Social Work, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, Albany

Discussion leader: Max Silverstein, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Mental Health, Philadelphia

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Important Elements in Stimulating Citizen Responsibility*

Presiding: Mrs. Frances T. Cahn, Executive Director, National Council of Jewish Women, New York

*How Does the Agency Develop Leadership Potentialities?*

Florence Sytz, Professor, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans

*What Influences the Individual toward Growth? How Can Leadership Influence Community Life?*

Mrs. Charles Kellern, Jr., President, Urban League of New Orleans

Floor discussion

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Mental Health

"To Serve the Mind." National Film Board of Canada, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York

## Program

247

"We the Mentally Ill." National Association for Mental Health, 1790 Broadway, New York  
Floor discussion

2:00 P.M.—3:00 P.M.

### *Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

#### International Films

"Gaon Saths" (Friends of the Village). Inquiries should be addressed to The Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York

"Assignment Children." United Nations Children's Fund, New York

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

### *Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

"Farewell Oak Street." National Film Board of Canada, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York

"The Invader." Center for Mass Communication, Columbia University Press, 1125 Amsterdam Avenue, New York

## WEDNESDAY, MAY 23

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

### *General Session. Integration and Desegregation*

Presiding: Thomas J. S. Waxter, Second Vice President, National Conference of Social Work; Director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore

#### 1. Progress in Desegregation

Carl T. Rowan, author, *South of Freedom*; reporter, Minneapolis Tribune

#### 2. Desegregation and Integration in Social Work

Mrs. Savilla Millis Simons, General Secretary, YWCA of the U.S.A., New York

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

*Committee on Personnel and Administration (joint session with Section I—Group Meeting 6). A Ten-Year Plan for Improving Public Assistance*

### *Section I. Services to Individuals and Families*

GROUP MEETING 1. SPECIFIC PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE TREATMENT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT

Presiding: Charles Leonard, Superintendent, Connecticut Child Treatment Home, Hamden

The Work of the Referral Units of the New York City Youth Board

Mrs. Mary Diamond, Director of Child Welfare, New York City Youth Board

Discussant: Charles H. Shireman, Director, Hyde Park Youth Project, Chicago

**The Casework Program in the New York State Training School for Girls**

Abraham G. Novick, Superintendent, New York State Training School for Girls, Hudson

Discussant: Mrs. Dorothy Banton, Executive Director, Kruse School, Marshalltown, Del.

**GROUP MEETING 2. CASEWORK TREATMENT OF CHILDREN**

Presiding: Leon H. Richman, Executive Director, Bellefaire Regional Child Care Service, Cleveland

1. The Casework Treatment of Children in Foster Home Care  
Mrs. Houston M. Mitchell, Director of Casework, Children's Bureau, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.
2. The Casework Treatment of Children in Institutional Foster Care  
Mrs. Eadith Morales, Supervisor of Casework, Ridge Farm, Lake Forest, Ill.
3. Casework Treatment of Children in a Family Agency  
Alice McCabe, Director, East River District, Community Service Society of New York

**GROUP MEETING 3. REHABILITATION—PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS AND DIFFERENCES**

Presiding: Chauncey A. Alexander, Associate Director, Los Angeles County Heart Association

Panel members: Bettye M. Caldwell, Director, Child Evaluation Clinic, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis; Edward B. Shires, M.D., Medical Director, Rehabilitation Institute, Kansas City; Isabel Stamm, Associate Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 4. SOME TECHNIQUES IN THE TREATMENT OF CHARACTER DISORDERS IN MARITAL PROBLEMS**

Presiding: Mrs. Patricia Sacks Fingert, St. Louis

Mrs. Frances H. Scherz, Casework Supervisor, Jewish Family and Community Service, Chicago

Discussant: Jean M. Leach, Assistant Casework Director, Family Service of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 5. INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL CASEWORK

Presiding: Anna King, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York

Marguerite Pohek, Chief, Unit for Europe and Africa, Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations, New York

Discussant: Eva Burmeister, Institutional Consultant, Family, Old Age, and Children's Division, Social Planning Council of St. Louis

GROUP MEETING 6. (CO-SPONSORING GROUP: COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION). A TEN-YEAR PLAN FOR IMPROVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Presiding: George M. Keith, Deputy Director, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, Madison

Corinne H. Wolfe, Chief, Division of Technical Training, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: Robert B. Canary, Chief, Division of Social Administration, Ohio State Department of Public Welfare, Columbus; Eleanor G. Cranefield, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Floor discussion

GROUP MEETING 7. WHY DO FAMILY AGENCY CLIENTS DISCONTINUE DURING THE EXPLORATORY PHASE OF SERVICE—MOTIVATION, CAPACITY, OR OPPORTUNITY?

Presiding: Clark W. Blackburn, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York

Lilian Ripple, Director, Research Center, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago

Discussant: Louis J. Lehrman, Professor of Social Casework, School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh

GROUP MEETING 8. (JOINT SESSION WITH SECTION II—GROUP MEETING 6). SERVICES TO THE AGED

*Section II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups*

GROUP MEETING 1. CONTRIBUTION OF DAY CAMPING TO SOCIAL WORK

Panel chairman: John H. Ledlie, National Council, Young Men's Christian Association, New York

Reynold Carlson, Associate Professor, School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Indiana University, Bloomington

Panel members: Elaine Switzer, Associate Executive Secretary, Division of Education and Recreation, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago; Frank Kiehne, Assistant General Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of St. Louis; Abe Hagiwara, Program Director, Olivet Institute, Chicago; Howard Gibbs, As-

sociate Director, Program and Personnel Service, Boys Clubs of America, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 2. COMMUNITIES ON THE MOVE—A CONTRAST TO SUBURBIA**

Presiding: Ned Goldberg, Executive Director, Young Men's Jewish Council, Chicago

Vacuum or Service in the Old Neighborhood?

Simon Slavin, Executive Director, Educational Alliance of New York

Discussant: Margaret Berry, Field Secretary, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhoods Centers, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 3. SOCIAL GROUP WORK PRACTICE IN PSYCHIATRIC SETTINGS**

Presiding and discussion leader: Violet Tennant, Associate Professor, Division of Social Service, Indiana University, Indianapolis

1. Current Questions on the Use of Social Group Work in the Psychiatric Setting

Dorothea Spellmann, Professor of Group Work, School of Social Work, University of Denver

2. Administrative, Educative, and Practice Problems Related to Establishing and Continuing Social Group Work in Several Psychiatric Settings

Panel members: Jack Simus, Supervisor of Group Work Services, and Dorothy Lundvall, Senior Group Worker, Bellefaire Jewish Children's Home, Cleveland; Grace Ganter, Group Work Consultant, and Art Blum, Senior Group Worker, Cleveland Child Guidance Center; Henry Tanaka, Supervisor, Social Service Department, Caroline Tempio, Senior Group Worker, and John Matsushima, Senior Group Worker, Cleveland Receiving Hospital and State Institute of Psychiatry

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 4. EXTENDING SERVICES TO YOUTH**

Presiding: William Schwartz, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Chicago

Implications for Planning and Practice in Extending Services to Youth  
Marjorie Main, Coordinator, Unreached Youth Project, Welfare Federation of Cleveland

Problems of Contact and Referral in Extending Services to Youth  
Irving A. Spergel, Project Supervisor, Neighbors United of Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, New York

Floor discussion



GROUP MEETING 5. PROGRAM SERVICES FOR THE FAMILY

Panel Chairman: Duane Robinson, Director, Bethlehem Community Center, Chicago

Panel members: Mark Battle, Director, Lower North Centers; Geraldine Bremmer, Assistant Executive Director, Girl Scouts; Mary Jane Eaton, Program Director, Trumbull Park Branch, South Chicago Community Center; Charles Garvin, Director of Social Services, Henry Booth House—all of Chicago

GROUP MEETING 6 (CO-SPONSORING GROUP: SECTION I). SERVICES TO THE AGED

Presiding: Hollis Vick, Staff Associate, Health and Welfare Planning Department, United Community Funds and Councils of America, New York

The Day Care Center for the Aged—a Multifunctional Service

Gertrude Landau, Executive Director, William Hodson Community Center, New York

Planning for the Development of a Day Care Center for the Aged

Mrs. Elizabeth Watkins, Assistant Director, Division of Public Assistance, Cook County Department of Public Welfare, Chicago

Floor discussion

*Section III. Services to Agencies and Communities*

GROUP MEETING 1. THE PUBLIC AGENCY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING IN SMALLER COMMUNITIES

Presiding: Mrs. Alice S. Adler, Assistant Director, Public Relations Service, Family Service Association of America, New York

Mrs. William S. Kilbourne, Consultant on Volunteer Service, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Nelson Stephenson, State Consultant on the Development of Community Service, North Carolina State Department of Welfare, Raleigh

Morris Hursh, Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Public Welfare, St. Paul

GROUP MEETING 2. RELATIONSHIP OF SOCIAL WELFARE PLANNING TO PHYSICAL PLANNING IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Presiding: Rudolph Danstedt, Executive Director, Social Planning Council of St. Louis

Howard Hollenbeck, Executive Secretary, Group Work and Recreation Division, Social Planning Council of St. Louis

William Coibion, Director, City Planning Commission, St. Louis

Mrs. Robert Bassett, member of the West End Community Conference, St. Louis

Discussant: Sydney Markey, Director, Philadelphia County District, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia

**GROUP MEETING 3. IMPACT OF NATIONAL SERVICES ON A LOCAL COMMUNITY**

Presiding: Conrad Van Hyning, Executive Director, American Social Hygiene Association, New York; Chairman, Quota and Support Committee, National Social Welfare Assembly  
Wilbur Maxwell, Director of Utica Study, Utica, N.Y.

Faber Stevenson, Executive Director, Greater Utica Community Chest and Planning Council, Utica, N.Y.

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 4. DEALING WITH HEALTH AND WELFARE PROBLEMS IN SMALLER, RAPIDLY EXPANDING COMMUNITIES**

Presiding: Harold C. Patrick, Executive Director, Community Chest, Paducah, Ky.

Mildred K. Wagle, Family and Children's Service, Lancaster, Pa.  
Thomas Sherrard, Executive Director, San Bernardino County Council of Community Services, Calif.

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 5. DEALING WITH HEALTH AND WELFARE PROBLEMS IN CHANGING METROPOLITAN AREAS**

Presiding: Harry Serotkin, Director, Regional Health and Welfare Planning Council of Social Agencies, Kansas City

C. F. McNeil, Director, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia

L. P. Cookingham, City Manager, Kansas City

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 6. DEALING WITH HEALTH AND WELFARE PROBLEMS IN RURAL AREAS**

Presiding: Mrs. J. J. Butler, Consultant in Community Organization, Association of Community Councils of Kansas City

Thomas F. Looby, Commissioner, Community Service Division, City Government of Kansas City

Arthur W. Nebel, Director, School of Social Work, University of Missouri, Columbia

Floor discussion

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Recruitment and Interpretation of the Profession

"School Social Worker." Audio-Visual Services, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

"Social Worker." National Film Board of Canada, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York

"People and Me." Council on Social Work Education, 345 East 46th Street, New York

Discussion leader: Mrs. George H. Abbott, Dallas, Texas

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

*Committee on Financing of Social Welfare Services*

Budgeting and Financing of Welfare and Health Services by Government

Presiding: Fred K. Hoehler, Consultant to the Mayor of Chicago  
Mrs. Eveline M. Burns, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Discussants: Garrett W. Keaster, Executive Secretary, Illinois Public Aid Commission, Chicago; George M. Keith, Deputy Director, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, Madison; Henry L. McCarthy, Commissioner, New York City Department of Welfare

Floor discussion

*Committee on Methods of Social Action*

How Do We Obtain Action toward Social Welfare Objectives—Local, State, and National?

Panel chairman: Arthur Dunham, Professor of Community Organization, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Panel members: Nelson C. Jackson, Director of Community Services, National Urban League, New York; Robert H. MacRae, Executive Director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago; Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, Secretary, National Committee on the Aging, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York

Floor discussion

*Committee on Personnel and Administration*

GROUP MEETING 1. MEETING THE PROBLEM OF SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PRIVATE AGENCY

Panel chairman: Roland Artigues, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana

Panel members: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph C. Walen, Director, Catholic Service Bureau, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Mrs. Ruth I. Kaiser, Executive Secretary, California Conference on Social Work, San Francisco; Donald Kingsley, Executive Director, Welfare and Health Council of New York City; Emanuel F. Berlatsky, Director, Bureau of Personnel and Training, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 2. MEETING THE PROBLEM OF THE SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PUBLIC AGENCY**

Panel chairman: Harvey Peterson, Director, Division of Public Assistance, Wyoming State Department of Public Welfare, Cheyenne

Panel members: Martha Moscrop, Training Supervisor, Social Welfare Branch, Department of Health and Welfare, Vancouver, B.C., Canada; Mrs. Louise N. Mumm, Staff Consultant, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York; Mrs. Ella W. Reed, Consultant on Professional Services, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago; Esther Lazarus, Director, Baltimore Department of Public Welfare

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 3. MEETING THE PROBLEM OF THE SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF EDUCATION**

Panel chairman: John C. Kidneigh, Director, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Panel members: Joseph W. Eaton, Visiting Professor of Sociology, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland; John C. Kidneigh, Director, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Rev. John J. Lennon, Dean, National Catholic School of Social Service, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.; Elizabeth Wisner, Dean, School of Social Work, Tulane University, New Orleans; Werner W. Boehm, Director and Coordinator of Curriculum Study, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Floor discussion

**GROUP MEETING 4. MEETING THE PROBLEM OF THE SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF A CHILDREN'S SERVICE AGENCY**

Panel chairman: Howard G. Gibbs, Associate Director, Program and Personnel Service, Boys' Clubs of America, New York

Panel members: Mildred Arnold, Director, Division of Social Services, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Ruth Joyce, Assistant Professor in Child Welfare, School of Social Work, St. Louis University, St. Louis; Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, New York; Anne-marie Schindler, Assistant Director, Personnel Department, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., New York

Floor discussion

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*  
*Social Group Work in Practice*

Panel chairman: John J. Horwitz, Associate Director, Curriculum Study, Council on Social Work Education, New York

Panel members: Mrs. Agnes A. Louard, Director of Recreation and Education, Union Settlement, New York; Irving Miller, Lecturer in Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York; Margaret Mudgett, Executive Director, Neighborhood Association, Los Angeles; Murray Ortof, Supervisor, Student Research and Training Project, William Hodson Community Center, New York

"Boy with a Knife." Community Chest of Los Angeles Area, 729 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles

4:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M.

*National Conference of Social Work. Social Action—What's Your Role?*

Presiding: Mrs. Eveline M. Burns, First Vice President, National Conference of Social Work; Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Case presentation: Wilbur Cohen, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

American Public Welfare Association: Loula Dunn, Executive Director

National Association of Social Workers: Joseph P. Anderson, Executive Secretary

National Conference of Social Work: Wayne Vasey, member of Executive Committee; Dean, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

National Social Welfare Assembly: Robert E. Bondy, Director  
Floor discussion

6:00 P.M.-8:00 P.M.

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Children

"First as a Child." Available from State Health Departments

"Mike Makes His Mark." National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

"Thursday's Children." British Information Services, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York

"Tuesday's Child." National Association for Retarded Children, 99 University Place, New York

8:30 P.M.

*General Session. Labor and Social Welfare*

Presiding: Robert H. MacRae, Executive Director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago

Joseph A. Beirne, President, Communication Workers Union; Vice President, AFL-CIO; Chairman, Community Services Committee of AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

#### THURSDAY, MAY 24

9:15 P.M.—10:45 A.M.

##### *Combined Associate Group Meeting. When Agencies Say "No"*

Presiding: Fred K. Hoehler, Consultant to the Mayor of Chicago

1. Handling the Individual Applicant  
Dorothy de la Pole, Executive Secretary, Travelers Aid Society, Los Angeles
2. Interpretation to the Broad Community  
Richard P. Overmeyer, Public Relations Director, Welfare Federation of Cleveland
3. Use of Overdemand for Services in Community Planning  
Ellery Reed, Director of Research, Community Health and Welfare Council, Cincinnati
4. Interagency Cooperation in Face of Overdemand  
David S. DeMarche, Director of Community Organization and Research, United Service Organizations, New York

##### *Combined Associate Group Meeting. Communications Clinic*

Discussion leader: Everett Shimp, Director, School of Social Administration, Ohio State University, Columbus

##### *Combined Associate Group Meeting. Adoption in the U.S.A.—1956*

Presiding: Mrs. Irving Edison, Board of Directors, Child Welfare League of America, St. Louis

##### *Principles, Values, and Assumptions Underlying Adoption Practice*

Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, New York

##### *New Frontiers in Home-finding*

Michael Schapiro, Director, MARCH, San Francisco

##### *Floor discussion*

##### *Combined Associate Group Meeting. The Effect of Child-rearing Patterns on Mental Health in the U.S. Today*

Presiding: Ralph Collins, Executive Secretary, Travelers Aid Society of Chicago

##### *Child-rearing Patterns in White-Collar and Professional Families in the U.S. Today*

Lois Murphy, Consulting Psychologist, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kan.

Child-rearing Patterns in Low-Income Families in the U.S. Today  
Martin B. Loeb, Community Studies, Kansas City

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Services to the Aging

"Our Senior Citizens." New York City Department of Welfare

Introduced by: Gertrude Landau, Executive Director, William  
Hodson Center, New York City

"A Place to Live." National Committee on the Aging of the National  
Social Welfare Assembly, 345 East 46th Street, New York City

Introduced by: Mrs. Geneva Mathiasen, Secretary, National Com-  
mittee on the Aging of the National Social Welfare Assembly, New  
York City

Floor discussion

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. How Restrictive Residence Re-  
quirements Hamper Our Services*

Presiding: Laurin Hyde, General Director, National Travelers Aid  
Association, New York

1. Medical Services

Mrs. Ruth B. Taylor, Chief, Medical Social Consultant, Tuberculosis  
Program, Division of Special Health Services, Public Health Service,  
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington,  
D.C.

2. Child Welfare Services

Edna Hughes, Field Consultant, Child Welfare League of America,  
New York

3. Psychiatric and Mental Health Services

V. Terrell Davis, M.D., Director of Mental Health, State Depart-  
ment of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, N.J.

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Adoption in the U.S.A.—1956*

Presiding: Mrs. Irving Edison, Board of Directors, Child Welfare  
League of America, St. Louis

What's Wrong with Adoption Agency Services in the Eyes of the Lay  
Public

Ernest A. Mitler, special counsel, Subcommittee to Investigate  
Juvenile Delinquency of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judi-  
ciary, Washington, D.C.

What's Right and Wrong with Adoption Service: the Agency View-  
point



Mrs. Florence G. Brown, Executive Director, Louise Wise Services,  
New York  
Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. Recruiting for Social Work—the Experience of Industry in Recruitment of Professional Personnel and Its Implications for Social Welfare Agencies*

Presiding: Norman Lourie, Pennsylvania Department of Welfare, Harrisburg

Wendell Huntington, Vice President, Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis

Panel moderator: Alex Rosen, Bureau of Personnel and Training, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

Panel members: Mrs. Eleanor Bernheim, New York; Mrs. George Abbott, Dallas; Mrs. Muriel Henry, Director, Careers Committee in Nursing, New York

Floor discussion

*Combined Associate Group Meeting. The Effect of Child-rearing Patterns on Mental Health in the U.S. Today*

Presiding: Mrs. Ione A. DuVal, Director, Immigrant's Protective League, Chicago

Discussants: Samuel P. Berman, Executive Director, Ridge Farm, Lake Forest, Ill.; Mark A. Rosen, Supervisor Pupil Personnel, City Schools, Gary, Ind.; Florence Ray, Secretary, Group Work Council, Welfare Federation of Cleveland

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Services to the Aging

"Still Going Places!" Home for the Aged and Infirm Hebrews of New York

Introduced by Marie Galpern, Home for the Aged and Infirm Hebrews of New York

Floor discussion

2:00 P.M.—3:30 P.M.

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

Tolerance and Human Relations

"Commencement." The President's Committee on Government Contracts, Washington, D.C.

"A Train of Action." The Evangelical and Reformed Church, Philadelphia

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

*Committee on Audio-visual Aids*

**Film Showings**

"Top Assignment." Community Welfare Council of Milwaukee County,  
606 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee

"Non-Verbal Communication." Department of Medicine and Surgery,  
Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.

**FRIDAY, MAY 25**

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

*Section I. Services to Individuals and Families*

**Emerging Stability: the Impact of Industrialization on Family Life—  
Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lecture**

Presiding and discussion leader: Frank J. Hertel, Associate General  
Director, Community Service Society of New York

Harold L. Wilensky, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department  
of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Discussant: David G. French, Executive Secretary, Coordinating  
Committee on Social Welfare Research, University of Michigan,  
Ann Arbor

Floor discussion

*Section II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups*

**Social Group Work Theory and Practice Viewed against New Trends  
and Developments**

Presiding: Florence Ray, Executive Secretary, Group Work Coun-  
cil, Welfare Federation of Cleveland

Gertrude Wilson, Professor of Social Welfare, School of Social  
Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Floor discussion

*Section III. Services to Agencies and Communities*

**What Is Community Organization Practice in Social Work?**

Presiding: Joseph P. Anderson, Executive Secretary, National As-  
sociation of Social Workers, New York

Violet Sieder, Professor of Social Work, New York School of So-  
cial Work, Columbia University, New York

Discussants: Bertram Beck, Associate Executive Secretary, Na-  
tional Association of Social Workers, New York; John B. Turner,  
Field Worker, Welfare Federation of Cleveland

11:15 A.M.-12:45 P.M.

*General Session. Has the Structure of Social Work Become Outmoded?*

Presiding: Benjamin E. Youngdahl, President, National Conference of Social Work; Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, civic leader and author, Washington, D.C.

Introduction of Conference President for 1957

## *Appendix B: Business Organization of the Conference for 1956*

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK is a voluntary association of individual and organizational members who have joined the Conference to promote and share in discussion of the problems and methods identified with the field of social work and immediately related fields.

### NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK AND ASSOCIATE GROUPS

#### NCSW OFFICERS

*President:* Benjamin E. Youngdahl, St. Louis  
*First Vice President:* Eveline M. Burns, New York  
*Second Vice President:* Thomas J. S. Waxter, Baltimore  
*Third Vice President:* Edward D. Lynde, Cleveland  
*Secretary:* Mrs. Val M. Keating, Dallas, Texas  
*Treasurer:* Arch Mandel, New York  
*Past President:* Arthur J. Altmeyer, Madison, Wis.  
*President-Nominee:* Margaret Hickey, St. Louis  
*Executive Secretary:* Joe R. Hoffer, Columbus, Ohio

#### NCSW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*Ex-officio:* Benjamin E. Youngdahl, President; Eveline M. Burns, First Vice President; Thomas J. S. Waxter, Second Vice President; Edward D. Lynde, Third Vice President; Mrs. Val M. Keating, Secretary; Arch Mandel, Treasurer; Arthur J. Altmeyer, Past President; Margaret Hickey, President-Nominee; Joe R. Hoffer, Executive Secretary

*Term expires 1956:* Frank T. Flynn, Chicago, deceased; Anne E. Geddes, Rockport, Mass.; Maxwell Hahn, New York; Mrs. John Mason Moore, Zionsville, Ind.; Sanford Solender, New York; Wayne Vasey, New Brunswick, N.J.; Morris Zelditch, New York

*Term expires 1957:* Victor D. Carlson, Denver; Franz Goldmann,

M.D., Boston; Maurice O. Hunt, Baltimore; Laurin Hyde, New York; David H. Keppel, Hartford, Conn.; Alonzo G. Moron, Hampton, Va.; Mrs. Russell Swiler, Gates Mills, Ohio

*Term expires 1958:* Elmer V. Andrews, Trenton, N.J.; Lyle W. Ashby, Washington, D.C.; Alton M. Childs, Chicago; Virginia Franks, Madison, Wis.; Eva Hance, San Francisco; Howard E. Thomas, Ithaca, N.Y.; Anne Wilkens, Austin, Texas

#### NCSW COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

*Chairman:* Mamie E. Davis, New York

*Term expires 1956:* Mary E. Blake, Minneapolis; Mamie E. Davis, New York; Rudolph N. Evjen, Oklahoma City; Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman, Milwaukee; Guy R. Justis, Denver; W. T. McCullough, Philadelphia; Dorothy M. McKay, Washington, D.C.

*Term expires 1957:* James Brindle, Detroit; R. E. G. Davis, Ottawa, Canada; Mary K. Guiney, Detroit; Ray Johns, Boston; Arthur Mandelbaum, Topeka, Kans.; Alpha Larsen Pepper, Hartsdale, N.Y.; Mrs. Susan Pettiss, New York

*Term expires 1958:* Harry L. Alston, Atlanta, Ga.; Mitchell I. Ginsberg, New York; Stuart K. Jaffary, Toronto, Canada; Mary Wells Milam, Miami; Charles F. Mitchell, Austin, Texas; Elma Phillipson, New York; Cynthia L. Stokes, Madison, Wis.

#### NCSW SECTION COMMITTEES

##### SECTION I. SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES

*Chairman:* Mary C. Hester, St. Louis

*Vice Chairman:* Bess Craig, Chicago

*Term expires 1956:* Aleta Brownlee, Washington, D.C.; Jules V. Coleman, M.D., New Haven, Conn.; Margaret Daniel, St. Louis; Dorothy D. Mueller, Cincinnati; Martha Moscrop, Vancouver, Canada; Frieda Ronnalis, St. Louis; Daniel Sullivan, St. Louis

*Term expires 1957:* Chauncey A. Alexander, Los Angeles; Jeanette Regensburg, New York; Samuel M. Wishik, M.D., Pittsburgh

*Term expires 1958:* Margaret R. Fitzsimmons, Chicago; Manuel Kaufman, Philadelphia; Henry H. Kessler, M.D., Newark, N.J.; Florence Poole, Urbana, Ill.

##### SECTION II. SERVICES TO GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS IN GROUPS

*Chairman:* Paul Simon, Urbana, Ill.

*Vice Chairman:* Florence Ray, Cleveland

*Term expires 1956:* Jerome Kaplan, Minneapolis; Mrs. Alfred E. Mudge, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Ruby Pernell, Minneapolis; Norman Polansky, Stockbridge, Mass.; Annemarie Schindler, New York

*Term expires 1957:* Elizabeth S. Magee, Cleveland; Dorothy B. Jones, Columbus, Ohio; Gladys Ryland, New Orleans; Anne B. Zaloha, Honolulu, Hawaii

*Term expires 1958:* Marie W. Fasig, Milwaukee; Mrs. Bartlett B. Heard, Berkeley, Calif.; Malcolm S. Knowles, Chicago; Norma J. Sims, Seattle

### SECTION III. SERVICES TO AGENCIES AND COMMUNITIES

*Chairman:* Daniel R. Elliott, Cleveland

*Vice Chairman:* Selene Gifford, Washington, D.C.

*Term expires 1956:* Mrs. Mildred Barry, Cleveland; Dean A. Clark, M.D., Boston; Betty Hartford, Cleveland; Seaton W. Manning, San Francisco; Roger Marier, Montreal, Canada; David Rabinovits, Cleveland; Edward S. Rogers, M.D., Berkeley, Calif.

*Term expires 1957:* Werner W. Boehm, New York; Beatrice L. Erickson, Juneau, Alaska; George S. Mitchell, Atlanta, Ga.; B. M. Pettit, San Diego, Calif.

*Term expires 1958:* Warren M. Banner, New York; John D. Carney, New York; Harry S. Jones, Charlotte, N.C.; Cecile Whalen, Washington, D.C.

### NCSW COMMON SERVICE COMMITTEES

#### COMMITTEE ON FINANCING OF SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES

*Chairman:* Samuel A. Goldsmith, Chicago

*Vice Chairman:* George M. Keith, Madison, Wis.

*Term expires 1956:* Paul T. Beisser, New York; Eskil Bjork, Chicago; Arnold Gurin, New York; Garret W. Keaster, Chicago; Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago; Jay Roney, Washington, D.C.; Daniel Ryan, Chicago; Homer C. Wadsworth, Kansas City, Mo.

*Term expires 1958:* Isador Beierfeld, Kansas City, Mo.; James Brown IV, Chicago; Ray Fornsberg, Waterloo, Iowa; Edward Keyes, New York; Edgar F. Witte, Chicago

#### COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF SOCIAL ACTION

*Chairman:* Richard Bachman, Columbus, Ohio

*Vice Chairman:* Mrs. Anne Arnold Hedgeman, New York

*Term expires 1956:* Eleanor Coit, New York; Morris Hursch, St. Paul, Minn.; Sidney Maslen, Washington, D.C.; Beulah T. Whitby, Detroit; Reginald Isaacs, Chicago

*Term expires 1958:* William B. Baker, Regina, Canada; Nelson Cruikshank, Washington, D.C.; Eleanor Dungan, Chicago; Ray Gibbons, New York; William Schwartz, Chicago

#### COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

*Chairman:* Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, New York

*Vice Chairman:* Roland Artigues, Urbana, Ill.

*Term expires 1956:* Karl deSchweinitz, Los Angeles; Louise Diecks, Louisville, Ky.; Howard Gibbs, New York; Ferdinand Grayson, Washington, D.C.; Margaret Murray Brownley, Palo Alto, Calif.

*Term expires 1958:* Anna Crane, Salt Lake City; Genevieve Gaborer, Washington, D.C.; Maurice J. Ostomel, Los Angeles; Harvey Peterson, Cheyenne, Wyo.; Herbert L. Pottle, Toronto, Canada

#### NCSW COMMITTEE ON AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS

*Chairman:* Elsa Volckmann, New York

*Vice Chairman:* Mrs. Beatrice Behrman, New York

*Term expires 1956:* Virginia M. Beard, Cleveland; Mrs. Doris Carduner, New York; John Horwitz, New York; Ruth Moore, Evanston, Ill.; James Orgill, New York; Mrs. Marjorie Watson, Columbus, Ohio

*Term expires 1957:* Mrs. Aline B. Auerbach, New York; Charles C. Cater III, New York; Marjorie Collins, New York; Mrs. Alberta Altman Jacoby, New York; John C. Milner, Los Angeles; George Myles, Chicago; Rob Roy, Philadelphia

*Term expires 1958:* Robert Disraeli, New York; Howard B. Gundy, Syracuse, N.Y.; Wallace E. Kendall, Baltimore; Kathryn Linden, New York; Marguerite Pohek, New York; Margaret Williamson, New York

#### NCSW EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

*Chairman:* Lois Corke, New York

Mrs. Elinor Zaki, New York; Ellen Winston, Raleigh, N.C.

#### SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR CASEWORK PAPERS, 1956

*Chairman:* Eva Burmeister, St. Louis

Frieda Romalis, St. Louis; Patricia Sacks Fingert, St. Louis

#### SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR GROUP WORK AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION, 1956

*Chairman:* Homer Bishop, St. Louis

Rudolph Danstedt, St. Louis; Howard Hollenbeck, St. Louis



**NCSW ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EXHIBITS**

*Chairman:* Helen Crosby West, New York  
Arch Mandel, New York; Guichard Parris, New York; Harriet Scantland, New York

**NCSW STAFF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

*Chairman:* Mrs. John Mason Moore, Zionsville, Ind.  
Mary Bruce, Columbus, Ohio; Robert B. Canary, Columbus, Ohio;  
Elinor R. Hixenbaugh, Columbus, Ohio

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OPERATIONAL RESEARCH IN NCSW**

*Chairman:* David French, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
Edward Olds, Baltimore; Mrs. Sophia Robison, New York; Merriss Cornell, Columbus, Ohio; William Blackburn, Columbus, Ohio

**PROGRAM CHAIRMEN FOR COMBINED ASSOCIATE GROUP MEETINGS**

*When Agencies Say "No"*

*The Public Relations Team in a Social Agency*

*Does Mass Support Mean Increased Public Understanding?*

James H. Scull, New York

*Communications—Theory and Practice*

*Interprofessional Communications—a Test Case Symposium*

*Communications Clinic*

Chauncey A. Alexander, Los Angeles

*A Nation on the Move—How? Who? Where?*

*Are Residence Laws Here to Stay?*

*How Restrictive Residence Requirements Hamper Our Services*

Laurin Hyde, New York

*Agency Teamwork in Older Communities*

Max Silverstein, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Mental Health, Inc., Philadelphia

*Important Elements in Stimulating Citizen Responsibility*

Mrs. Moise S. Cahn, New Orleans

*Working Mothers*

Teresa Farrell, Lansing, Mich.

*Adoption in the U. S. A.—1956*

Anthony DeMarinis, St. Louis

*The Effect of Child-rearing Patterns on Mental Health in the U. S. Today*

John W. Gandy, Chicago

*Recruiting for Social Work—the Experience of Industry in Recruitment of Professional Personnel and Its Implications for Social Welfare Agencies*

Alex Rosen, New York

**COMMITTEE ON COMBINED ASSOCIATE GROUP MEETINGS***Chairman:* Olcott Sanders, American Friends Service Committee

AFL-CIO Community Services Committee, Julius Rothman; American Public Welfare Association, Peter Kasius; Child Welfare League of America, Virginia Speirs; National Association for Mental Health, Richard P. Swigart; National Association of Social Workers, Joseph P. Anderson; National Association of Social Workers, Psychiatric Social Work Section, Mrs. Margaret Williams; National Travelers Aid Association, Isabelle Axenfeld; National Urban League, Nelson C. Jackson; United Community Funds and Councils of America, Robert F. Fenley; YWCA of the U.S.A., Ethlyn Christensen

**PROGRAM CHAIRMEN OF ASSOCIATE GROUPS**

Advisory Committee on Citizen Participation of UCFC, Robert F. Fenley

Advisory Committee on Social Service Exchange of UCFC, Kenneth I. Williams

AFL-CIO Community Services Committee, Julius F. Rothman

American Cancer Society, Rosamond Tatro

American Federation of International Institutes, Mrs. Ione Agnew DuVal

American Friends Service Committee, Olcott Sanders

American Home Economics Association, Gertrude Lotwin

American Immigration Conference, Mrs. Ruth Z. Murphy

American Jewish Committee, Samuel S. Fishzohn

American Legion National Child Welfare Division, Charles W. Geile

American National Red Cross, Robert S. Wilson

American Public Welfare Association, Loula Dunn

Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, Israel Moss

Association of the Junior Leagues of America, Robbie Hunt Burton

Big Brothers of America, Felix Gentile

Child Study Association of America, Gunnar Dybwad

Child Welfare League of America, Anthony DeMarinis

- Church Conference of Social Work, Carl L. Obenauf  
Common Council for American Unity, Read Lewis  
Council on Social Work Education, Ann Elizabeth Neely  
Episcopal Service for Youth, Edith F. Balmford  
Family Service Association of America, Clark W. Blackburn  
Florence Crittenton Homes Association, Mrs. Aileen D. Overton  
Girls Scouts of the U.S.A., Metropolitan Councils Conference, Helen M. Feeney  
International Conference of Social Work (U.S. Committee), Violet M. Sieder  
International Social Service (American Branch), Mrs. Susan T. Pettiss  
National Association for Mental Health, Richard P. Swigart  
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Reginald Johnson  
National Association of Social Workers, Esther Lazarus  
    Group Work Section, Murray E. Ortof  
    Medical Social Work Section, Leonora Rubinow  
    Psychiatric Social Work Section, Mrs. Margaret Williams  
    Research Section, Harold C. Edelston  
    School Social Work Section, Margaret Quane  
National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies, W. E. Sears  
National Association on Service to Unmarried Parents, Mrs. Margaret W. Miller  
National Child Labor Committee, Lazelle D. Alway  
National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Philip Soskis  
National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church, Muriel S. Webb  
National Council, YMCA's, Leslie J. Tompkins  
National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, Mrs. Ruth Z. Murphy  
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Robert L. Bond  
National Jewish Welfare Board, Emanuel Berlatsky  
National Legal Aid Association, Emery Brownell  
National Probation and Parole Association, Hugh P. Reed  
National Professional Committee on the Social Aspects of Epilepsy, Margaret Davis  
National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, Irving Rimer  
National Social Welfare Assembly, George W. Rabinoff  
National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Mrs. Eveline S. Jacobs  
National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, Sarah A. Butts  
National Travelers Aid Association, Isabelle Axenfeld

National Urban League, Nelson C. Jackson  
Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Mrs. Doris L. Rutledge  
Salvation Army, Donald McMillan  
Social Work Vocational Bureau, Margaret B. Hodges  
United Community Defense Services, John Moore  
United HIAS Service, James P. Rice  
United Housing Foundation, Roger Schafer  
United Seamen's Service, O. J. Hicks  
YWCA of the U.S.A., Ethlyn Christensen

# Index

- ADC, *see* Public assistance
- Administration of social agencies, 125-26, 128; desegregation and integration, 70-76; medical care program, 115-16; public assistance, 120-21; union members on boards, 79
- Adolescent offenders, *see* Juvenile delinquency
- Adoption, 130-42; public relations in, 130-31, 134-36, 137; role of agency in, 131, 134-42
- Adoptive parents: qualifications for being, 133; rights of, 131-32
- AFL-CIO, 77-85; Community Services Committee, 78-79; community services program, 78-80
- Africa, 64-65
- Aging, the, 128, 182; effect of industrial society on, 207-8; Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, 101-2, 105; public assistance, 102-3, 105
- Aliens and foreign-born, 180-81, 189-90, 192, 195
- American Friends Service Committee, integration and, 74
- Asia, 64-65
- Assistance, public, *see* Public assistance
- Automation, 17-19, 83; economic results of, 217-18; effect on living standards, 214
- Baltimore, desegregation in, 71-72
- Beirne, Joseph A., paper by, 77-85
- Biestek, Felix P., S.J., paper by, 86-95
- Camping: experiments in social responsibility, 224-34
- Casework, *see* Social casework
- "Challenge of change, the," 3-25
- Child placing, *see* Adoption
- Children, Aid to Dependent, *see* Public assistance
- Children, delinquent, *see* Juvenile delinquency
- Children, dependent, *see* Public assistance
- Child welfare, 16, 105-6; adoption, 130-42; divorce, 211; juvenile delinquency, 105
- China, 50, 51-52
- Civil liberties, *see* Civil rights and civil liberties
- Civil rights and civil liberties, 12-13, 39-40, 43, 58-66
- Communism, 11, 44, 45, 46, 56
- Communist Control Act of 1954, 48-50
- Communist party, 49-50
- Community councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Community development, 163, 172
- Community organization for social work, 38, 123, 128, 160-74; suburbanization and, 218, 219; union support of, 78-79
- Community planning, *see* Community organization for social work
- "Conformity and Freedom," 42-57
- Councils in social work, 171
- Councils of social agencies, *see* Councils in social work
- Counseling, *see* Guidance and counseling
- "Current Social Frontiers," 3-25
- Curriculum in social work education, *see* Education for social work
- Delinquency, *see* Juvenile delinquency
- Democracy, 11-12, 13, 33-36, 38-41, 56-57, 59, 80, 84, 163, 165-66
- Demography, 175-201
- "Demography and Human Ecology in Relation to Social Work," 175-201
- Dependency, *see* Public assistance
- Dependent children, *see* Public assistance
- Desegregation, 12, 39, 58-66, 67-76; *see also* Integration; Negroes
- "Desegregation and Integration in Social Work," 67-76
- Disability assistance, *see* Public assistance
- Disability insurance, *see* Social insurances
- Disabled, the, 128; medical care, 110; Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, 122; public assistance, 102-3

- Discrimination, *see* Civil rights and civil liberties
- Divorce, 208-9; Hopi Indians, 210-11
- Ecology, 175-201
- Economic conditions, 9-10
- Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lectures, The, 175-234
- Education, 28-29, 39, 99-101; desegregation in, 12, 71; Federal aid for, 99-101
- Education for social work, 127-28; community organization, 172-73; curriculum, 127, 128, 154-55; schools of social work, 32-33, 34, 40, 74-75, 104, 124-25, 127, 128, 146, 172-73; social group work, 146, 147-48
- Employment: labor force in United States, 182-83
- Family counseling, *see* Guidance and counseling
- Family life education, 10
- Family living, 183-84, 185-86, 196-97, 208-10, 215-16; children, 136-37, 211, 213; divorce, 208-9, 211; Hopi Indians, 210-11; impact of industrialization, 202-19; "life-cycle community," 218; migration, 206-7; religion, 91; suburban, 213-15
- Family social work, 10, 103-4, 216-17, 219
- Family welfare, 103-4
- Federal agencies in social work, 30
- Federal aid, *see* Child welfare; Education; Public assistance; Public welfare
- Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *see* United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
- Financing of social work, 105-6, 113-15; grants-in-aid for medical care, 114
- Folsom, Marion B., paper by, 96-106
- Foreign-born, *see* Aliens and foreign-born
- Germany, Nazi, 52-54
- Goldmann, Franz, M.D., paper by, 107-19
- Government, *see* United States: Federal Government
- Governmental social work, *see* Public assistance; Public welfare
- Group process, 150-53, 168
- Groups, work with, *vs.* social group work, 155-57, 159
- Group work, *see* Social group work
- Guidance and counseling, 216-17; family, 10
- "Has the Structure of Social Work Become Outmoded?" 26-41
- Hauser, Philip M., paper by, 175-201
- Health, *see* Medical care; Mental health; Public health
- Health and welfare planning, *see* Community organization for social work
- Health insurance, *see* Medical care
- Hopi Indians, divorce among, 210-11
- Housing, 197; community organization in, 172; desegregation in, 72
- Illness, *see* Disabled, the; Medical care
- "Impact of Industrialization on Family Life, The," 202-19
- Industrialization, 143-45, 202-19
- Industrial revolution, 31, 83
- Insurance, social, *see* Social insurances
- Integration, 68, 83; *see also* Desegregation; Negroes; Segregation
- Intergroup work, *see* Community organization for social work
- International Conference of Social Work, 11
- International social welfare, 10-12; community development, 163, 172
- Interpretation of social work, *see* Public relations in social work
- Juvenile delinquency, 8, 105, 123, 187, 192, 195-96
- Kansas City, Mo., school desegregation in, 71
- "Labor and Social Welfare," 77-85
- Labor and social welfare, 77-85
- Labor standards: women in industry, 183, 196, 209-12
- Lindeman, Eduard C., Memorial Lectures, 175-234
- Living standards, 9, 18-19, 186, 197, 199, 214-16, 217; effect of automation, 83, 214; effect of suburbanization, 212-14
- Marriage, 204-5; statistics, 184-86
- Massachusetts: birth and mortality rates, 179; Joint Special Committee on the

- Inspection of Nunneries and Convents, 47-48; Special Commission to Investigate Subversive Activities . . . , 46-47
- Mass communication, 35-37, 54-55; on adoption, 130-31, 137
- Medical care, 9, 14, 82, 105; health insurance, 14; hospital insurance, 14; in public assistance programs, 107-19; union support of, 82
- "Medical Care in Public Assistance Programs," 107-19
- Mental health, 6-7, 15-16, 187-88; disorders of childhood, 16; National Mental Health Act, 6-7
- Mental hygiene, *see* Mental health
- Meyer, Agnes E., paper by, 26-41
- Migrants, transients, and travelers, 205-7
- Migratory workers, *see* Migrants, transients, and travelers
- Mississippi, attitude toward desegregation, 60, 63-64
- National Conference of Social Work, v, vii, 96, 106, 235; award, ix; business organization for 1956, 261-68; Eduard C. Lindeman Memorial Lectures, 175-234; program, 235-60
- National Conference of Social Work Award, ix
- National Mental Health Act, *see* Mental health
- National security, 39, 44-47, 49-50; civil liberties and, 13
- National social work agencies, integration in, 72-73
- Negroes, 12-13, 58-66, 69-76, 83, 181, 190-91, 193, 195, 198-99
- OASI, *see* Social insurances
- Old age, *see* Aging, the
- Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, *see* Social insurances
- "Our Challenge in Social Welfare," 96-106
- Parents: in adoption, 131 ff.
- Personnel standards in social work, 104, 125-26
- Philosophy of social work, 33-34, 86-95, 120-22, 127-28, 145, 146-47, 149, 150-54, 164-66
- Politics, 34, 35
- "Principles, Values, and Assumptions Underlying Adoption Practice," 130-42
- Psychiatry: religion and, 89-90; social work and, 89-90
- Public agencies, *see* Public welfare
- Public assistance, 6, 14, 102-3; Aid to Dependent Children, 103, 122, 124; cost of, 104, 114-15; disabled, 81, 110; improving, 120-29; medical care, 105, 107-19; Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and, 105; union support of, 82
- Public health, 7, 98-99, 103; medical care in public assistance, 107-19; medical research, 98-99
- Public relations in social work, 32-38; in adoption, 130-31, 134-36, 137
- Public relief, *see* Public assistance
- Public welfare, 6-7, 8, 14-16, 30-31, 123-24; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 30-31, 97, 101; Federal Government in, 96-106; medical care, 107-19; Social Security Act, 6, 80, 110; social security program, 13-15, 38, 80-81, 101, 200-201; state financing of, 114; states, public assistance laws in, 110
- Race relations, 12-13, 58-66, 83; *see also* Desegregation; Integration; Negroes
- "Real Tragedies of Desegregation, The," 58-66
- Rehabilitation, *see* Vocational rehabilitation
- Reid, Joseph H., paper by, 130-42
- Relief, *see* Public assistance
- Religion, 16-17; psychiatry and, 89-90; social work and, 86-95
- "Religion and Social Work," 86-95
- Research in social work, 7, 32-33, 38, 104-5, 124; group life, 223-34; statistics, 161-62; surveys and studies, 155-56, 159
- Rowan, Carl T., paper by, 58-66
- St. Louis, school desegregation in, 71
- Segregation, 12; *see also* Desegregation; Integration; Negroes; Race relations
- Sherif, Muzafer, paper by, 219-34
- Sieder, Violet M., paper by, 160-74
- Simons, Savilla Millis, paper by, 67-76
- Social action, 23-25, 35-36, 38, 74, by labor, 82



- Social casework, 21-23, 121, 127, 144-45, 173; in adoption, 132; religion and, 86-95
- Social change, 3-25, 58-66, 67-76
- Social group work, 143-59, 173, 221, 224-34; desegregation in, 72-73; identified as a specialization, 146; vs. work with groups, 155-57, 161
- "Social Group Work Theory and Practice," 143-59
- Social insurances, 6, 14, 117-19, 122; disability insurance, 14, 81; hospital insurance, 14; medical care, 118-19; Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, 6, 101-2, 105, 122; unemployment insurance, 6, 81-82; union support of, 81-82; workmen's compensation, 6
- Social planning, *see* Community organization for social work
- Social problems, 3-25, 199-201; adoption, 130-42; automation, 17-19, 83; desegregation, 12-13, 39, 58-66; juvenile delinquency, 8; medical care, 14; mental health, 15-16; preventive social work, 21-23; slums, 188-91, 192, 197; unemployment, 9
- Social psychology, 219-34
- Social research, *see* Research in social work
- "Social Responsibility and the Group," 219-34
- Social sciences and social work, 26-27, 32, 145-47, 148, 167, 175-76, 219-34
- Social Security Act, *see* Public welfare
- Social security program, *see* Public welfare
- Social work, financing of, *see* Financing of social work
- Social work, governmental, *see* Public assistance; Public welfare
- Social work, international, *see* International social welfare
- Social work as a profession, 3-25, 26-41, 66, 75-76, 121-22, 145-59, 201; community organization, 160-74; desegregation and integration in, 12, 68-76; interdisciplinary relations, 16-17, 28-29, 32, 86-95; religion and social casework, 86-95; social casework, 21-23, 86-95, 121, 144-45; social group work, 143-59; specialization within, 29-31
- Social work personnel, *see* Personnel standards in social work
- Social work practice, *see* Social work as a profession
- Social work research, *see* Research in social work
- Sociology, 175-76
- Suburbanization, 212-14
- Surveys and studies in social work, *see* Research in social work
- Taylor, Telford, paper by, 42-57
- "Ten-Year Plan for Improving Public Assistance, A," 120-29
- Training for social work, *see* Education for social work
- Unemployment, 9, 37
- Unemployment insurance, *see* Social insurances
- Unions, labor, *see* AFL-CIO; Labor and social welfare
- United States: aliens and foreign-born, 189-90, 192, 195; birth rate, 177-79; economic conditions, 9-10; Federal aid for education, 99-101; Federal Government and public welfare, 96-106; foreign policy, 11, 50, 51; immigration, 180-81, 189-90; mental health, 15-16; mortality, 179-80, 185, 195; Supreme Court decision on desegregation, 12-13; the South, 12, 37, 39, 59, 60, 61-65, 70, 83, 181; unemployment, 9
- population, 177-201; age structure of, 181-82, 195-96; composition of, 21, 195-96; increase of, 194-95; labor force in, 182-83, 196; mortality, 185; shifts in, 19-21; suburbanization of, 19; urbanization of, 186-87, 188-91, 197
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 30-31, 97, 101
- Unmarried parents, 139-41
- Urbanization, 186-87, 188-91, 197, 211-12; slums, 188-91, 192, 197
- Vocational rehabilitation, 101
- Voluntary agencies, 7; union support of, 80
- Volunteers in social work: union members, 84
- Welfare, public, *see* Public welfare
- Welfare councils, *see* Councils in social work
- "Welfare state," 7, 33
- "What Is Community Organization Practice in Social Work?" 160-74

## *Index*

273

Wilensky, Harold L., paper by, 202-19

Wilson, Gertrude, paper by, 143-59

Wolfe, Corinne H., paper by, 120-29

Workmen's compensation, *see* Social insurances

Youngdahl, Benjamin E., paper by, 3-25

Young Women's Christian Association, integration in, 73

Youth services: research in social responsibility in boys' camp, 224-34